



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Be 2220.32



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

PERSONAL RIGHTS.

SPEECHES

OF

P. A. TAYLOR, ESQ.,

(LATE M.P. FOR LEICESTER.)

LONDON:

THE VIOLENCE ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENCE OF
PERSONAL RIGHTS,

4, WILKINSON'S COURT, LONDON, E.C. 4.

To be had of the Secretary, Price 3d. Post free.

1881.

PERSONAL RIGHTS.

“SPEECHES

OF

P. A. TAYLOR, ESQ., //

(LATE M.P. FOR LEICESTER.)

PUBLISHED BY

THE VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENCE OF
PERSONAL RIGHTS,

2, WESTMINSTER CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

1884.

Br 2220.32



LONDON :

PRINTED BY PEWTRESS & Co.,

Steam Printing Works,

28, LITTLE QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

RETIREMENT OF MR. P. A. TAYLOR.

INTRODUCTION.*

IN these days of Liberal lip-service, when party is everything and ideas are nothing—when he who is foremost on the Treasury Bench is “Lord, Lord” to those who sit on the same side, be his measures what they may, the retirement of a man like Mr. P. A. Taylor from Parliamentary life is a calamity. At a time when Opportunism, long triumphant at the head of the Government, has so effectually taught the nation to accept the shadow for the substance and words for things, that constituencies select their representatives, not for their personal character or convictions, but even as the butchers choose the silly sheep at market by the well-known brands (L or C) upon their fleecy sides; and these representatives flock right and left with about as much individual initiative as sheep crowding into the accustomed fold—the withdrawal from the political field of one who for nearly a quarter of a century has openly despised party and defied Opportunism and given both Ministers and the public assurance of a Man, is a National loss. As the *Leicester Daily Post* (June 21, 1884), truly says: “There never was a question in Mr. Taylor’s mind as to the side to be taken on any subject but the question of Justice, which he determined according to the best of his judgment, acting upon the conclusion at all risks.” The same journal adds that he “will never be forgotten in Leicester” (we believe he will never be forgotten in England) “his devotion to truth and justice; his fearless and outspoken independence of character; his readiness to

* Reprinted from the *Journal of the Vigilance Association*, July 15, 1884.

encounter all sorts of obloquy in defending the oppressed or advocating an unpopular cause, have endeared him to many, and especially to the labouring classes. An honest man never breathed."

Mr. Taylor was already a conspicuous politician before he was elected member for Leicester in 1862, having become known to friends and foes as an indomitable Radical when working by his father's side in the Anti-Corn-Law and Church Rate Agitations before he was first scoffed at, then listened to and ultimately respected even in the cynical atmosphere of St. Stephen's as "the leader of Forlorn hopes," the "Champion of forgotten rights" and the "Redresser of unheeded wrongs." He enjoyed the friendship of men like Peronnet Thompson, W. J. Fox and J. S. Mill, with whom he shared the labour and expense of the attempt to bring General Eyre to justice.

A sincere believer in the sacredness of nationality, Mr. Taylor was the life-long friend of Joseph Mazzini, and in his unflinching obedience to Principle at any cost and unswerving faith in Justice, *quand même*, it is easy to recognise the influence of the great Italian at whose bidding during the short triumvirate the national decrees were issued "in the name of God and the People." This ideal of Republican equality has, in fact, governed Mr. Taylor's political life, and since it has but small resemblance to the ideas which govern what are called politics in England at the present day, we cannot but regard it as a satisfactory and encouraging fact that a man so dissimilar from the vast majority of those among whom his political lot was cast, should, by his simple, dignified persistence in carrying out his own notion of duty, have won the cordial respect even of those members of the House most hostile to him in opinion. From being at first sneered at as "the revolutionary," then marvelled at as "the eccentric member for Leicester," Mr. Taylor came to be spoken of as "the Incorruptible of the House."

The following is a condensed record of Mr. Taylor's Parliamentary speeches, as well as those specially addressed to the Vigilance Association. Although he no longer regards himself as physically fit for the labour of representing Leicester, Mr. Taylor, so long as he draws breath, will ever be, in the very highest sense, a representative of the people, and especially of that portion of the people, male or female, who are still left politically voiceless. For ourselves, we are well assured that his sympathy, aid and counsel will be ours whenever they are needed; but the loss to the people through Mr. Taylor's retirement is something much more than this. It is a light gone out; for it is the loss of the fearless example of one who, high above the waves of party strife, has stood steadfast like a beacon, upholding in the eyes of the nation the noble old device—*Fais ce que dois, advienne que pourra.*

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE GAME LAWS	7
THE HARES AND RABBITS BILL	12
PAYMENT OF MEMBERS	13
SUNDAY TRADING	23
SUNDAY OPENING OF MUSEUMS	29
THE MUTINY ACTS	43
OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL	45
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN THE NAVY	48
OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL (No. 2.) ...	51
COMPULSORY VACCINATION	55
LETTERS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS	75

MR. TAYLOR'S PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.

GAME LAWS.

MR. TAYLOR first spoke upon this subject in the House of Commons, in April, 1869, in opposition to Mr. Lock's motion for a Select Committee on the question. He pointed out that the question had been thoroughly sifted by the Select Committee of 1845-46, which had issued an exhaustive Report upon it, extending to 1,598 pages, and containing 26,603 questions. Not one of the ameliorative recommendations of the Committee had been carried out, but one recommendation had been carried into effect, which, as Mr. Taylor remarked, was not surprising, considering the constitution of that House, viz., that hunting and coursing should be allowed without a license. . . . A minority report was also drawn up, and the views of the minority were:—That the police should not be employed in enforcing the Game Laws; that the Night Poaching Act should be repealed; that there should be no limitation of time for killing, and that owners and occupiers should have the same absolute right in dealing with game as they now exercised in regard to any other product of the soil; that persons who preserved game on their own lands should be liable for the damage done on the lands of other persons; and that no time should be lost in repealing laws *so injurious to agriculture and demoralising to labour*. These recommendations remained untouched, and by the Act passed in 1862 for the purpose of enabling the police to assist in the preservation of game, the old constitutional principle of supposing a man innocent till he is proved guilty was distinctly violated. . . . Important as was the question with respect to the interest of

tenant farmers, other and more important interests were actually involved—the interests, namely, of the whole community, in respect of the waste of its productive power, and, more important still, the demoralising effect produced upon the labouring population. From 9,000 to 10,000 convictions took place under these laws every year. Take the case of a contract between a landowner and his tenant where the latter agrees to pay £200 a year of rent, reserving the game to the landlord, for a farm for which he would otherwise give £400; that might be an arrangement satisfactory to the farmer, especially if he were fond of sport and a slovenly farmer, but it would by no means satisfy the interests of the country, or save the demoralization of the people. A landlord had no more right to overstock his land with hares than he had to breed Bengal tigers. . . . The hares devoured and destroyed food that would feed thousands. . . . In this view of the case, he thought Lord Elcho had made a mistake when he declared that a provision, making invalid an agreement between landlord and tenant, reserving the property in game to the former, would be an unprecedented violation of the principles of the common law. Mr. Taylor held that such a provision partook of the nature of an immoral, and, therefore, not binding agreement, amounting, in fact, to a conspiracy to produce wild animals to an extent injurious to the public weal. Some maintained that, if the so-called Game Laws could be abolished, and the same results produced either by making game private property, or by increasing the stringency of the Trespass Law, all that was essential would be effected. He, Mr. Taylor, maintained that the evil lay in the forced maintenance of a too large quantity of wild animals in the midst of a civilized community.

In the following year Mr. Taylor introduced a Bill for the Abolition of the Game Laws. . . . Blackstone himself, he said, denounced these Laws. “ From this root (Forest Laws)

has sprung a bastard slip, known by the name of the Game Laws, founded upon the same unreasonable notions of property in wild creatures." . . . "But," Mr. Taylor added, "I might refer to the reports of the majority of the Commissioners. They acknowledge that the greatest injury is done to the crops by the game, and they thus inferentially condemn the whole system. They admit, in fact, that damage is done to the interests of the many, in the interests of, or rather, I should say, for the pleasures of the few. Under the Act of 1862, we find the Chief Constable of Cheshire instructing his men to stop persons and carts on the highway, without a warrant, in order to search for game, abrogating the practice and spirit of the constitution, which says that every man shall be held innocent until he is proved guilty. What, however, is the constitution when put in comparison with the Game Laws?" . . . "I know it is said that gentlemen do not try their own cases when they come before the Bench. Sir, there is not a greater mockery in the world than that of a game-preserver retiring from the Bench in order not to judge a case of poaching that happens to take place upon his own land. A, B, C, and D, four game-preserving gentlemen, sit upon the Bench, and when a man is brought before them charged with poaching, say upon the land of A, he magnanimously retires from the Bench, and I dare say from the justice-room, and B, C, and D proceed to do justice on the delinquent, I have no doubt in the purest spirit of the Christian axiom, namely, to do to the poacher upon another man's land as they would that other men should do unto poachers upon theirs."

The Bill did not pass, but in April, 1871, Mr. Taylor again introduced it. After giving statistics of the yearly convictions under those laws, and appealing to the House to "consider how much there was of sorrow and of wrong underlying those dry figures, how much of people

led into crime, and how much of family and individual suffering," he went on to speak of the agricultural labourers, "about those who, when we talk about agricultural interest, should be taken into account as an important element—about those who do not fall under this temptation of poaching. The whole class are suffering under a condition of existence which is a disgrace to our civilization; and the Game Laws have a very positive and practical effect in producing that condition. Every system of laws which tends to prevent land being brought into the best condition, or tends to make it scantily cultivated, with the use of little labour or manure, or which tends to make the trade of the farmer less wholesome and regular and, in consequence of the depredation of the game, more of a speculation, must act directly upon the condition of the labouring classes. . . ." Having quoted many authorities in support of this statement, Mr. Taylor went on to describe the deer forests in Scotland as the most striking and terrific illustration of the sacrifice of the interests of the country by men of great wealth to the love of sport. "The evil example of Sutherland," he said, "has been followed up in various other counties in the North of Scotland. Between 1811 and 1821, three-quarters of a million acres were, to employ the euphemism of the time, 'resumed' by the nominal proprietors, and in this way 3,000 families—that is to say, 15,000 inhabitants—were driven from the interior, their villages demolished or burnt. The transition from farms to sheep is not more easy nor so easy as that from sheep to deer. I do not mean to say that all these three-quarters of a million acres are now turned into deer forests, but a very considerable amount of them are. I have taken great pains to get the most authoritative information upon the subject, and I am told that, if the Sutherland deer forests do not now exceed those in other counties in Scotland, they are likely to do so." Having given terrible details of the misery and wholesale

depopulation of large districts of Scotland from such and similar reckless abuse of the power of wealth, Mr. Taylor said, "I may state the case of another glen on Dee side, converted into a deer forest within the last twenty-five years. To accomplish this object thirty families were dispossessed. The glen formerly supported on an average 4,500 sheep, and three to four hundred head of cattle. It yields now, I believe, fifty to sixty head of deer annually, so that we find that to produce a pair of red deer costs the country fifty sheep and four cattle, and a human family has to be dispossessed to make way for them. It is really too bad that the national interests and the rights of various important classes should be sacrificed to a morbid love of sport, which, if regard be had to the timid nature of the animals that are the object of the sport, can, at best, only be termed effeminate athleticism. . . . I am quite aware that the mere abolition of Game Laws is insufficient to deal with so enormous an evil as the deer forests of Scotland. Laws to be administered pre-suppose an existing population, whereas in this case the population is made to disappear in order that wild animals may take their place. But I say that the House is bound to take at least the first step, and no longer to give legislative sanction to wrongs so great as I have described. The more I think of this question of the Game Laws, the more convinced I am that my Bill, or something as thorough in its principle, is the only popular remedy that exists. There is no half-way house between the present Game Laws and absolute abolition. . . ."

Mr. Taylor founded the *Anti-Game Law League*, in July, 1872. The publications issued by that Association did great service in enlightening the public mind on the question. The reasons given by the League for the abolition of the Game Laws were the following:—

"1. Because the Game Laws diminish the area of land under cultivation. 2. Because they promote the aggregation

of land in enormous holdings, and render impossible the acquisition of homesteads by the Labourer and Artisan. 3. Because they lessen the capital employed on the land, and diminish the quantity of food produced. 4. Because they cause the multiplication of wild animals, which consume and destroy an enormous quantity of food. 5. Because they thus enhance the price of food. 6. Because by creating a legal offence which is no sin, they form a manufactory for the production of criminals to the extent of many thousands annually. 7. Because they greatly injure the nation for the sake of the wealthy class."

THE HARES AND RABBITS BILL.

MR. TAYLOR spoke shortly in criticism of "The Hares and Rabbits Bill" (August 10, 1880), pointing out that those for whom he was principally concerned—the people of England—were not at all considered in that "insignificant" Bill, and noting the wonderful change of opinion since he first came to the House on this question. "I have been told many times that I am a fanatic on this question, but I shall, really after what has taken place, be inclined to look upon myself as a prophet. When I heard hon. gentlemen, from the mountain of the Opposition, declare that the evil of the Game Laws was a crying and an enormous one, with which the farmers of this country neither could nor would put up much longer, I was not surprised to find that I had a Government pledge at no very distant date to my measure for the abolition of the Game Laws."

In Committee on the Bill, Mr. Taylor protested against the assertion that the principle of the Bill was one of confiscation. . . . The assertion was feeble and futile; feeble because not based on fact, futile because the people well understand that "confis-

cation" is the cry raised by privilege whenever its august monopolies are threatened. "This has been illustrated by the opposition raised to every great measure of reform which has been carried, or which yet remains to be made law. When national funds—long misappropriated to sectarian purposes—are proposed to be devoted to national interests, at once you raise the cry of confiscation; nay, even if it is proposed, by an extension of the suffrage, to bring all citizens within the pale of the Constitution, hon. gentlemen opposite actually seem to think that this, too, is a confiscation of their political privileges. . . . I, Sir, . . . would charge with confiscation the owners of the soil—predominant in Parliament—who robbed the population of this country of their property in the wild animals that lived on it, and which, by the natural customs of the world and by the Common Law of England, were their rightful inheritance. With unparalleled audacity they first confiscated for their own pleasures the property of the people in the wild animals of the country; they then taxed the community to maintain the game for their sport; and then they consigned thousands upon thousands to prison or exile if they ventured to assert their natural proprietorship by snaring a rabbit or shooting a pheasant. . . .

"In this parrot cry of confiscation," said Mr. Taylor in conclusion, "the people hear the cry of a privileged class, who have proved throughout centuries of their country's history that they value more highly the pleasures of sport than the interests of their country, or the rights of their countrymen."

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

In April, 1870, Mr. Taylor brought in a Bill "To restore the Ancient Constitutional Custom of Payment of Members of the House," "a practice supported by the precedent

of hundreds of years in our own history, by all but universal adoption in every country but our own which has any pretence to representative institutions, and so entirely in unison with the principles of common sense and justice that, to my mind, our recurrence to the system of payment of members is a question of time only . . . payment of members did prevail in this country for centuries. . . Hon. gentlemen opposite are always professing, I am sure, quite earnestly, their respect and veneration for the British constitution. . . . From the very beginning of parliamentary government down to some two centuries ago—the system of payment of members was universal and unquestioned.

“But, of course, I shall be here met with the observation, that the conditions which rendered payment of members appropriate in those days have entirely passed away, and given place to others, under which payment of members would be as absurd now as it was appropriate then; that in those old days to be sent to Parliament was no object of ambition, but a troublesome duty, involving an expenditure of time and trouble, for which payment of wages was an essential condition; whereas now there is no need to pay persons for undertaking an office which is the object of general ambition. Upon this point I join issue absolutely. The principle of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, sound enough as applied to the affairs of trade, if applied to morals or to politics, is but another phrase for corruption and bribery. Observe to what conclusions this reasoning would take us, if logically pursued—as, when the man does not desire to be sent to Parliament he must be paid for it, so when it is an object of moderate desire he must pay his own expenses; and, as soon as it becomes the object of universal ambition, why should he not purchase that which others have to sell, and which he has the means to buy? If I am not mistaken, there are few of us who have not heard such

arguments adduced, with more or less covering of decent phraseology.

"In my view, when the change took place, our system of Government incurred a risk—rather an actuality—of mischief, which required to be dealt with in a very different manner. The system of corruption then inaugurated, and which in later times has swelled to such terrible proportions, should have been met by stern repressive legislation, and certainly not indorsed and accepted by cessation of payment to members. Payment of members is the symbol of a system of honest work fairly remunerated, while non-payment symbolises a system which can hardly be more laconically illustrated than by a well-known politician of two generations back, who, in a moment, as I presume, of post prandial candour, thus apostrophised his constituents: 'I bought you, and, by G—, I'll sell you!' . . . I think the change of which I have spoken should, for obvious reasons, have been met by a transference of the charge from local to imperial funds, and perhaps I need hardly say that such is the nature of the proposition I am about to make to the House. I lately met with a curious little illustration of how the question was regarded by a shrewd observer two centuries ago:—

"Mr. Secretary Pepys relates that he 'dined in the City on the 30th of March, 1668, with many men of mark;' that he there got into conversation with the rest of the company on state affairs; and that all concluded that the bane of Parliament had been the leaving off the old custom of the places allowing wages to those that served them in Parliament, by which they chose men that understood their business and would attend to it, and they could expect an account from them, which now they cannot.'

"I have found considerable difficulty in tracing exactly when and how the custom of payment of members arose.

. . . Dr. Henry's *Great Britain*, vol. x., p. 63, says:—

" 'All the members of the House of Peers always attended

Parliaments at their own expense, that being one of the services they were obliged to perform for the baronies they held of the crown. But as soon as the smaller tenants of the king *in capite*, or freeholders, were permitted to appear by representatives, they were subjected to pay the expenses or wages of these representatives. This custom of representatives receiving, and their constituents paying, wages, commenced with the commencement of representation, from a principle of common equity, without any positive law. . . . The proudest and most opulent knights thought it no dishonour to receive their wages, and even to sue for them; and no man in those times imagined that this custom ever could or would be changed, as it was so reasonable, and productive of so many good effects; particularly it engaged the attendance of all the members to the very last day of every session, because those who did not attend from the first to the last day received no wages, and their negligence could not be concealed from their constituents. Accordingly we often find all the members present, and receiving writs for their expenses, at the dissolution of a Parliament.'

"Apparently the practice ceased to be universal at least 250 years ago, though it is asserted (in Lyson's *Cornwall*) that wages were paid in some Cornish boroughs as late as the eighteenth century. Payment was enforceable at law, and from a passage in Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors*, it would appear at least an open question whether the law or custom might not be put in force at the present day. Lord Campbell says:—

"'Lord Nottingham's most important decision while he held the Great Seal probably was, that the obligation on constituencies to pay wages to their representatives in the House of Commons still continues. . . . I know no reason, in point of law, why any member may not insist on payment of his wages. . . . For this point of the People's Charter—payment of wages—no new law is required.'

“ But it is worthy of note that from the commencement of the agitation for parliamentary reform towards the close of last century, down to about the year 1840, almost every great scheme of reform, whether springing from Whig magnates or from the Radical party, embodied the principle of payment of members.

“ In 1780 the electors of Westminster appointed a committee upon elections ; C. J. Fox, chairman. In their report to the electors they recommended payment of members. Immediately after, the Society for Constitutional Information was established in London. At the head of this society was the Duke of Richmond, president ; supported by the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Effingham, the Earl of Surrey, the Earl of Selkirk, Viscount Mount-Morris, and Lord Kinnaird, and by eleven distinguished members of the House of Commons.

“ This society adopted the ‘ Report of the Committee of Westminster,’ reprinted it in great numbers, and distributed it far and wide.

“ In the year 1830 Lord Blandford introduced into the House of Commons a Reform Bill, which was supported by all the leading Liberals in the House. In his speech he observed :—‘ As the object of this Bill is to restore the representation to its ancient purity, I propose, among other excellent old laws now either repealed or become obsolete, to restore the principle and practice of paying members the wages of attendance, according to the value of money at the present day, which I consider should be two pounds a day for citizens and burgesses, and four pounds for knights or members for counties.’ In 1837 there arose a great agitation for the People’s Charter. That document was drawn up by a committee consisting of six working men and six members of Parliament (amongst the latter were such men as O’Connell and Mr. Roebuck), and contained this provision :—‘ Be it enacted, that every member of the House of Commons be entitled at the close of the session to a writ of expenses on the Treasury for

B

his legislative duties in the public service, and shall be paid £500 per annum.'

"Again, in 1842 there was established an association, of which I had the honour to be a member, called the Metropolitan Parliamentary Reform Association. One of the objects in its programme was, 'that each representative of the people should be paid for his services;' and amongst the promoters of this society I find such names as Henry Warburton, J. A. Roebuck, Wynn Ellis, Milner Gibson, Joseph Hume, the Earl of Radnor, J. Scholefield, and many others of note.

"I do not propose to make payment dependent upon attendance, nor, indeed, to set up any parliamentary surveillance over members. I think this might be safely left, as now, to the decision and observation of the constituencies. It is for them to select representatives who hold their opinions and will do their work.

"By an Act of Parliament, A.D. 1541, it was declared that, if any member left the House without the leave of the Speaker before the end of the session, he should have no claim for wages from his constituents.

"In 1580 the House of Commons resolved to fine all knights of the shire £20, and citizens, burgesses, or barons, £10 each, if they absented themselves without leave during the whole of the session. It was provided that, in the case of those members who had been absent without leave for only part of the session, they should forfeit and lose the benefit of receiving their wages, and the Clerk of the Crown was prohibited from delivering out any writ for levying the wages or allowances for any such knight, citizen, Burgess, or baron, without leave of the House.

"And in 1626 fine and imprisonment were decreed by the House of Commons for non-attendance."

Having minutely described the practice of foreign countries; after showing that the practice may be said to exist in every

country but one (Spain),—(except England and some of its dependencies),—where there is any pretence to parliamentary government; and noting that there seems a distinct relation between freedom of institutions and the amount of remuneration, the United States standing at the head, and Italy at the bottom of the list, Mr. Taylor said that while the measure he proposed might stand on its own merits, it would, if passed, have an indirect action upon—1. The duration of Parliaments; 2. The number of members; 3. The question of more equal electoral districts.

“ Though the repeal of the Septennial Act is,” he added, “ a measure quite inevitable under any circumstances, still, I think that payment of members would clearly hasten that repeal. I believe, too, that, under the system I propose, the excessive numbers, as many think, of this assembly would naturally come under revision. In regard, again, to electoral districts, it is evident that existing anomalies would be made still more glaring by the fact of an equal stipend being paid to the representatives alike of a few hundreds or of many thousands.”

The main objects to be attained by the proposed measure, Mr. Taylor stated to be: “ 1st. To give to constituencies the widest possible area for selection; and 2nd, that the men they choose should be as far as possible rendered independent of corrupt influences.” But he thought payment of members was extremely desirable with regard to the admission of working men into the House.

“ I maintain that no other means can possibly avail to insure that end short of a recurrence to the system of payment of members. Sir, there is no quarter of this House, I think, from which the desire has not been expressed to see on these benches some representatives of the working men. I fear those declarations will be received with but little faith if the House refuses to entertain this measure, and if, whenever a working man appears on the hustings, candidates from

the Carlton Club or the Reform Club come forward to crush him beneath the weight of their long purses.

“ If it be said that a poor man in the House must be subject to personal temptations, I reply, that that argument must be carried to the extent of excluding all poor men, and therefore working men; and that, if such are to sit in this House—as we all profess to desire—payment for their services is the only protection that can be afforded to them.”

“ The reforms in this House, which have taken place as the result of a long course of public agitation, have had for their aim to get this country out of the slough of class legislation. The evils of class legislation may exist—nay, be as rampant—under a system by which you limit the choice of constituencies, as under one by which you deny them votes. Suppose, for instance, you gave the people universal suffrage, but limited their choice to great landed proprietors; should any of us expect that the question of the Game Laws would be likely to be discussed with entire impartiality? Or if, under universal suffrage, the choice of the constituencies were limited to railway directors, is it likely that our means of locomotion would be particularly safe or satisfactory? And so, if you maintain a system under which only the wealthy can gain admission to this House, what wonder is it if the interests of wealth and of privilege are more considered than the rights of the people or the interests of labour? Does anyone doubt that such is the fact?—I ask any hon. member to recall the groan of despair that echoes from bench to bench at a proposition to add a penny to the income-tax, as compared with the dignified equanimity with which we discuss the taxes on tea. The objection raised is that, under this system, the character and tone of the House would be degraded, and that it would be made the arena for petty personal ambition, instead of being, as it is assumed to be now, full of disinterested desire for the public weal.”

“What real ground is there for this theory that in relation to political action all the ordinary principles of common life are to be reversed, that in regard to them alone it is held that the labourer is not worthy of his hire, or at least that the mere touch of mammon—*i. e.*, of payment for services rendered—degrades and lowers the recipient? Do we not pay all classes of employment and professions, some of which at least are ordinarily supposed to be of a higher and more elevated type? We pay our ministers of religion, although the same cynical observation as to the result of remuneration might be deemed applicable with greater force. Might it not be said that we were bribing one of the most important classes of the community to profess opinions which they did not hold, and, like Shakespeare’s scurvy politician, seem to see the thing they do not? Do we not pay our doctors, and is not that open to the obvious remark that we give a pecuniary temptation to men in whose hands we are all but powerless, to make us ill, and keep us so? We pay our army and navy, and is not this equally open to the remark that we create a class of men whose interests lie in war, and not in peace? Payment for services, I repeat, rendered to the community—payment sufficient to tempt men to devote themselves to the studies by which they may render themselves fit to exercise the various offices which humanity requires—is the rule of our society and of the world. We do not, it is true, pay M.P.s and J.P.s, and cynics have not been wanting to declare that it was doubtful whether the legislative functions of the one, or the judicial functions of the other, were performed with less efficiency or satisfaction. But, sir, we even pay politicians, so soon as they become official politicians. Of course I am told: ‘Oh, that is quite a different thing; they have to devote their time and abilities to the public service.’ The inference is unmistakable: this devotion is not expected in unpaid members of

Parliament. Sir, that is my argument: where there is payment, duties are recognised; where there is not payment, the contrary is the natural inference. But I shall be told we can always find out of the leisure class men willing to undertake the duties of a member of Parliament. Is not the same the case in regard to at least all the higher orders of officialism? . . . There attaches to officialism power, influence, patronage, unknown to the humble member. I am really not sure that I might not use the *à fortiori* argument, and say that, if either members or officials must work for nothing, it had better be the latter than the former.

“ It is said that the country would not stand the expense. What! England, — the richest country on the face of the earth,—the only one that can't afford to pay for honest legislation! Sir, if I am told that the country is already overburdened with taxation, and cannot stand this charge, I can only answer it by saying that, on that very ground, the country cannot afford *not to pay* its legislators, and that upon the simplest of all grounds, just as not one of us would accept the services of bailiff, steward, or butler, if he should offer to serve us without pay, because we all know that gratuitous work is generally not good work, and that it is cheaper and better to pay for work that is to be paid for directly and openly, rather than by some indirect and probably sinister mode. Sir, I venture to prophesy that in the first Parliament of paid members a saving will be effected equal to half a century's salaries. . . . Upon this question of economy I shall ask the House to permit me to read one more extract, and it shall be the last, to see how differently the wise reformers of last century thought on this matter. In an address (dated 1781) from the York Committee of the Constitutional Association, to which I have already referred, I find this passage:—

“ “ But though the corruptibility of Parliament may be justly dated from that innovation of royal authority [*creation*

of *small boroughs*], the actual corruption of it was reserved for a more unfortunate period. The seeds of political depravity were for ages latent in the defective frame of the House of Commons; and it was possible they might still have remained there, in a state of harmless inactivity, if chance and the ill-judged parsimony of our forefathers had not presented to the crown the opportunity of parliamentary seduction. From the depreciation of money, the ancient salary paid by the counties, &c., to their respective members had become too insignificant to be worth their acceptance, and from a most absurd frugality, the necessary augmentation had been improvidently omitted.'

"And this was signed, amongst a number of county magnates, by such men as the Rev. Mr. Wyvill, chairman; the Earl of Effingham, the Dean of York, Sir George Strickland, Sir R. D. Hildyard, Sir James Norcliffe, &c., &c.

"That, Sir, is my case for payment of members." . . .

SUNDAY TRADING.

MR. TAYLOR's first speech on the subject of Sunday Trading was in opposition to Mr. Thos. Hughes' Bill (1871). He showed that the existing Act, "passed in the reign of that eminently virtuous monarch Charles II.," was of so sweeping and severe a character, that its general application was simply impossible; that one reason for this was that it was "an honest Act, dealing with the rich as well as the poor, with tradesmen of every grade, and with labour as well as trade,"*

* The Act of Charles II. enacted that "all and every person whatsoever shall, on every Sunday, apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately." That "no tradesman, artificer, &c., or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly labour or work of their ordinary callings except necessity or charity."

and that Mr. Hughes' Bill sought so to moderate the provisions of that Act as to make it workable upon the poor, but to let the rich escape altogether. Moreover, Mr. Hughes, "in attempting to give new vitality to the principle of Sunday Legislation was giving encouragement, under the auspices of a so-called religious association, to a new class of persons exercising their ordinary calling, and that not exactly one of necessity or charity, on the Sunday—the miserable class of spies and informers who on that day go about to spy, inform against and ruin other people; and their ordinary calling is not interfered with by this Bill." Mr. Taylor had, he said, spent the last Sunday morning in enquiring into the case of a poor woman living in Kensington who "had fallen under the ban of these harpies" (the spies employed by the Sabbatarians), and had "four times that year been dragged before the magistrates for the sin of selling a cigar. On the last occasion," added Mr. Taylor, "the agent of a religious society—and it makes one sick to talk of religion in connection with such proceedings—an agent of a religious society called on this poor old woman, and, informing her that his secretary was gone for a summons, added that he would summon her and fine her seven shillings every week unless she closed her shop, and no doubt he will be as bad as his word. This poor woman assures me that the harmless articles she sells on Sunday form an important proportion of her little business, and that in face of this continued persecution she has no alternative but to shut up her shop, and go to the workhouse. . . . What is the action of the police in such a matter as this? Substantially they follow the maxims of the spy system. . . . Sir Richard Mayne, in his evidence before the Committee on the Sunday Liquor Trade in 1868, said, 'I have now a considerable number of policemen employed every Sunday to watch publicans, taking them from the very important duties of protecting life and property. They have to practice an objectionable concealment,

as putting on a different dress, and generally they have to say or do something intended to mislead persons as to what they really are,'—that is Sir Richard's euphemism for lying. 'These are objections, and the more restrictions there are, the more there will be of this.' Again, Sir Richard said, 'People evading the law employ touts to watch for the police; in many cases where the law is evaded detection does not follow, although the police know of the evasion.' . . . It is a Bill in which Dives proposes to legislate for Lazarus. . . . This House does not represent the mass, but the wealth, of the people. It is obvious that any such restrictions as those contained in this Bill must act specially upon the poor. Their wages are often paid late on Saturday night, and it is often necessary for them to delay their purchases till Sunday morning. Then, they have frequently no convenience for keeping food in their houses, and were they so to keep it, it would be subject to deterioration and injury. I repeat, this is emphatically a law against the poor. If it were a law against all work, such as was the Act of Charles II., it would be at least general in its application. Probably the chief work done in this metropolis on Sundays is the work of domestic servants. I should say there is no member of this House who has not one, two, or three persons ministering to his own comfort; and where the wealthy are aggregated together for their own convenience and comfort, as in the clubs and so forth, you find the same thing on a larger scale. But does the hon. gentleman propose to deal with that? Not a bit of it."

" . . . The Bishop of Gloucester distinctly declared in the House of Lords that this Bill 'must greatly interfere with the means of livelihood of a great many of the poorer classes.' I think that sentence alone ought to be sufficient to make the House pause before it passes this Bill. I declare in all earnestness, that in the face of the present harrowing condition of suffering in many parts of this city—and espe-

cially at the East End—it would be an act little short of insanity to pass a Bill which throws any difficulty in the way of enabling people to get a livelihood.

“ . . . I have already alluded to the extent to which the Act of Charles II. might be applied to the avocations and recreations of the wealthier classes, provided there were magistrates who had sufficient courage and sense of justice to carry it out to its fullest extent. In one of these debates a member told a story of a person in humble life, who, having been convicted of Sunday trading, took out an information against the vicar's coachman, and the effect of this was to keep every carriage away from Islington Church. The magistrate who tried the case held that it was contrary to law to drive a carriage on Sunday, unless it could be shown to be an act of necessity, in which category it seemed he did not include the act of riding instead of walking to church . . . let the House beware of retaliation on the part of the working classes if they pass this Bill, and let hon. members recollect how many acts of the wealthier classes violate Sabbatarian legislation. . . . This Bill is defended on the ground that it would act as a protection to the honest and religiously-minded trader who would be happy to shut up his shop on a Sunday, but who finds that the money-grubbers and irreligious shopkeepers of the neighbourhood will not permit him. . . . The Bill, when looked at from that point of view, would be simply to protect the scruples of the great at the expense of the necessities of the small. Here we have people who are wealthy and good, but who at the same time are afraid to shut up their shops on Sundays lest their poorer neighbours should monopolize all the Sunday trade. If these rich people have scruples, let them indulge them at their own cost, and not endeavour to combine religion with worldly wisdom, by levying the cost of their abstention from Sunday trading out of the pockets of the poor.”

The Bill was defeated by a majority of 33.

Sir Thomas Chambers' Sunday Trading Bill (April, 1872), was also defeated by a majority of 29. Mr. Taylor opposed it saying that it was more objectionable than Mr. Hughes' Bill ; but " one and all, they were liable to the fatal objection that they applied only to the poor, and did not in any way touch the rich. The simple fact that it was deliberately attempted by the Bill to prevent the people from reading newspapers and periodicals on Sunday, was sufficient to condemn the measure."

ROYAL DOWRIES AND ANNUITIES.

MR. TAYLOR spoke against the grants of Royal Dowries and Annuities in 1871 (Dowry to the Princess Louise and Annuity to Prince Arthur), in 1873 (Annuity to the Duke of Edinburgh), and in 1874 (Annuity to Prince Leopold.) He thought it would have been better if Government had seen that the whole grace and decorum of such a proposition (Dowry to Princess Louise) depended entirely upon its being the result of the spontaneous and hearty goodwill of the taxpayers of the country, and he reminded the House that in the course he was taking he was the representative of the opinions of hundreds of thousands of their countrymen. Many public meetings had recently been held throughout the country, at which a strong and bitter feeling against the grant had been shown. In the division on that occasion Mr. Taylor was followed into the lobby only by Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Henry Fawcett.

On the proposal of the Government during the same year to grant an annuity to Prince Arthur, Mr. Taylor said :— " The masses of the people of this country feel—and I confess, I think, they are right—that the expenses of Royalty are altogether too great, and that those expenses, as was said of the power of Royalty in the last century, ' have

increased, are increasing, and ought to be diminished.' They think that the sum, and it cannot be estimated at less than three-quarters of a million of money per annum, is an excessive sum to pay for making provision for members of the Royal Family." He opposed the grant because it proposed to tax the people for no services rendered or to be rendered. Even taking for granted that provision of some sort were necessary, the people had already made sufficient provision for the maintenance of Royalty. He thought it might even be questioned whether they did not exceed the legitimate functions of the House of Commons when they raised a tax upon the community at large for the support of that which cannot be deemed essential; which is rather a matter of sentiment than of necessity for the conduct of the business of the country, and he reminded the House that Mr. Gladstone, during the previous session, when speaking of aided emigration for the poor, used these memorable words:—"We are considering one of the greatest of all subjects, viz., the proposal to support individuals at the expense of the community—individuals who are to be supported at the expense of the community, but not for duties done to the community." This was the language—sound, but somewhat ascetic—used by the right honourable gentleman in regard to the humblest and poorest of the community; did he now forget these principles when they should be applied to individuals at the very opposite end of the social scale?

In the division on that occasion 53 members voted in favour of Mr. Dixon's mild proposition to reduce the grant to Prince Arthur from fifteen to ten thousand pounds.

Mr. Taylor's speech against the second reading of the Duke of Edinburgh's Annuity Bill did not command as many supporters as Mr. Dixon's more timid proposal in regard to Prince Arthur; but the minority who voted with him consisted of 20 members, including tellers. When the annuity to Prince Leopold was proposed, Mr. Taylor briefly

re-stated to the House the reasons which had induced him to oppose all these grants, reminding the House that the 20 members who had voted with him against the grant to the Duke of Edinburgh represented constituencies amounting in the aggregate to 3,000,000 of people. He protested in the strongest terms against the proposal, but did not on that occasion divide the House.

SUNDAY OPENING OF MUSEUMS, ETC.

ON May 19, 1874, Mr. Taylor proposed a motion—"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to give greater facilities for recreation of a moral and intellectual character, by permitting the opening of museums, libraries, and similar institutions on Sundays." Since the last division of the House on the subject (1856), a great advance had taken place in public opinion. Two hundred clergymen had petitioned in favour of the motion, and there was a remarkable falling off in the number of petitions against it. In 1856 there were 629,000, this year there were very few indeed, from which he inferred a change in public opinion, and also in the honesty with which petitions were got up. He did not like to take exception to the mode of getting up petitions, . . . but in this case the ordinary license had been overstepped. Mr. Taylor said: "Two clergymen and one gentleman who gave his name and address, all from the same district, stated that in their district petitions were got up by young girls signing for their whole family, and signing, moreover, three times over—first at Sunday schools, then at home, and again at public meetings. As one of the clergymen says, pathetically, 'Religious people are so unscrupulous as to means!'"

Something of that spirit had been shown in a recent deputation to the Duke of Richmond, headed by Lord Shaftesbury, who was made to state (though, when after-

wards asked for an explanation, he admitted that he had no personal knowledge on the subject) that the deputation represented various working class societies, and that the working class was almost unanimous against Mr. Taylor's proposition. The Sunday League then canvassed a number of trade societies, clubs, shops, &c., through members of their own bodies. Mr. Taylor had before him the result of such canvass. A large number of tailors' shops in London employed from 18 to 20, up to 240 hands. Of the 79 shops, clubs, &c., so canvassed (there had been more since, but that was all he had before him), there were absolutely unanimous in favour of his motion 38; there were 30 all but unanimous, that is, with but one or two exceptions; and of the remaining 11 the general majority was perfectly overwhelming. He held in his hand certificates in every case from the official of each shop or society. He believed that if the working classes of this country could be polled there would be a large majority in favour of opening museums and libraries on Sundays.

"At the last election at Leicester," Mr. Taylor said, ". . . the question was discussed again and again at public meetings, and the result was that he was returned by a majority larger than most hon. gentlemen could boast of. In Hackney, where also the question was largely canvassed, the result was the return of Professor Fawcett, also by a large majority, so that, he thought it might be said that, in the only two constituencies where this was made a vital question, the friends of freedom on this point were returned by large majorities.

"When Sir Richard Wallace . . . sent his magnificent collection of pictures to Bethnal Green for the benefit of the population, contrary to his understood wishes, as well as to common sense, the people were shut out from viewing this collection on the only day when they could, at least with any convenience or leisure, derive benefit from it. Sir Richard might have pur-

chased a palace in Piccadilly; filled it with all the finest pictures in the world; sent tickets of admission to all the upper ten thousand; he might have had a line of carriages outside half a mile long every Sunday, and no blame would have attached to him, or those who availed themselves of his benevolence. It is only when the working and trading classes of the Eastern districts are sought to be benefited that we refuse permission, and this has been done against the most strenuous and honourable exertions of the Pastor of the district—to whom be all honour for the exertions he has made—the Rev. Septimus Hansard, who testified that in his opinion ‘nothing but *good* could result from the exhibition on Sunday afternoons of Sir Richard Wallace’s pictures in the Bethnal Green Museum;’ he adds, and I commend the words to the attention of my religious friends, ‘If “the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,” much more so was the Christian Sunday.’ . . . This is not a question of the abstract correctness of one set of opinions or of another—it is a question of the right of every man to decide upon it for himself—it is a question of toleration *versus* persecution.” . . .

“ My contention is, not that our views in regard to the sanctity of Sunday are correct, but that it is a question on which all classes of the community have a right to judge for themselves.

“ Now, my hon. friend will not deny for a moment that I can bring against his views of the question a cloud of witnesses, learned theologians, acute Biblical critics, and pious divines, established and non-established—men against whose character and learning he shall find nothing to object but that on this question they have the misfortune to differ from himself—who would tell him that, in their opinion, his opposition to my motion, on the ground of its being against the ordinances of Christianity, is a pure delusion—that, in fact, he is attempting to

transform a Jewish law into a Christian superstition. They would remind him that the law for the observance of the Sabbath was a Jewish law for the observance of the seventh day or Sabbath—what we call Saturday; and that it was in avowed commemoration of the most tremendous event which could occur in the history of the world. They would remind him that it is no light thing to transfer so solemn an edict from one day to another, and they would defy him to find a single passage in the Scriptures authorising the transference of the obligations of the Sabbath by the Jews to the first day by the Christians. They would tell him that, if he seeks to oppose my motion upon the basis of the Fourth Commandment, he is bound to keep holy the seventh day, and not the first. . . . They would remind him that the Founder of Christianity Himself was reviled and denounced by the authorities of His day precisely because He refused to accept their interpretation of the observance of their Sabbath; and that, if he desired to found his opposition to my resolution upon the ground of its being in opposition to the principles of Christianity, he would have to confess that he was more Christian than the Founder of Christianity Himself. In fact, he would be like the old Scotchwoman, spoken of by Dr. Doran, who, on pronouncing that to walk on the Sabbath Day was a deadly sin, was reminded that Jesus Himself had walked in the corn-fields on the Sabbath Day, to which she replied, ‘Ah, weel, it is as ye say, but I think nane the better o’ Him for it.’ It was not till the beginning of the sixteenth century that this heresy showed in any force. In 1516, Erasmus observed with regret the tendency towards Judaism excited by the revival of Hebrew literature, and strongly characterised it as a ‘pest the most dangerous to Christianity.’ Even in Scotland up to 1647, when the Westminster Confession was adopted, the Standard of the Church of Scotland was silent

as to the duty of keeping holy the Sabbath Day, as may be seen by reference to the original confession prepared by John Knox in 1560. In truth, the Sabbatical heresy is one that we owe to our Puritan forefathers of 300 years back; but . . . those of whom we are accustomed to speak as the fathers of the Reformation were entirely opposed to the principles of Sabbatarianism. Cranmer in his catechism (1548) says—‘And here note, good children, that the Jews, in the Old Testament, were commanded to keep the Sabbath Day; and they observed every seventh day, called the Sabbat or Saturday. But we Christian men in the New Testament are not bound to such commandments of Moses’ law concerning differences of times, days, and meats.’

“Calvin also repudiates what he calls ‘Sabbath worship.’ His words are—‘By changing the day, and yet attributing to this day, when changed, the same sanctity which the Jews did to their Sabbath, we retain the same typical distinction as had place among the Jews. Those who now cling to them go thrice as far as the Jews themselves in their gross and carnal superstition of Sabbath worship,” and Luther declares of the Sabbath or Sunday, that there is no necessity for its observance, and, if any one insists on these observances as a religious obligation, he adds—

“‘Then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall reproach this encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty.’” . . .

* * * * *

The spirit of Sabbatarianism is now, as it has always been, tyrannous, intolerant, and aggressive. It is continually seeking to cut off the innocent enjoyments and intellectual recreation of the people of this country, as well as to put society in general to all sorts of needless inconveniences, especially by the stopping of omnibuses and railways, and closing of postal and telegraphic means of communication; and in my

c

opinion, it is high time we put a stop to all legal recognition and enforcement of Sabbatarian views, for those who hold them are not content even with the powers they now have, but are continually endeavouring to increase them." . . .

"Whenever authority, whether ecclesiastical or civil, makes crime of that which is not sin, which is not vicious in the opinions or consciences of the people, it does what in it lies to demoralise the population, to confuse their sense of right and wrong, and harass and confuse their consciences. What opinion can the people form of humanity in general or of Christianity in particular, when they see such an illustration as this of the working of the system under which we live. The *North British Mail* has the following :— 'An old man named M'Kean, residing in the Drygate, Glasgow, is alleged to have died from destitution on the Sunday. It is stated that the city parochial authorities were informed of the case early on that day, but refused to visit the dying man, on the ground that "they had no inspectors on duty on Sunday."'

"I will trouble the House with a few words from a letter I have received from a Norfolk rector. I have received many letters, anonymous and others (this is signed); but I will not give the clergyman's name unless it is distinctly called for. He speaks of my course as 'an attempt which must eventually jeopardise my soul's safety, and, if successful, must involve myriads in the irremediable ruin in eternity.' He proceeds—'I beseech you, consider that the words you utter on the occasion of introducing your motion will be cited with terrible effect if not on your death-bed, most certainly at the bar of judgment. Fear to incur the Divine wrath; and be not envious of the ten thousand imprecations and bitter reproaches of the finally lost in eternal torments, through the act to which you are now committed.'"

* * * *

"But I ask the House, does it not argue a terrible depra-

vation of the moral sense, when a gentleman, a Christian and a clergyman, can thus consign me for ever to the infernal gods; and all because I have the misfortune to differ from him in regard to the sanctity of an institution which is neither ancient, Christian, nor reasonable?

“One more instance I must give, and I confess it strikes me with more disgust than the denunciation poured upon myself. The House will hear how a Priest of the Church of Christ teaches the little children whom, intending one may suppose, to follow the example of his great Master, he had invited to listen to him. The scene took place in London, and a clergyman, addressing some children, said—

“‘He knew a little boy who broke the Sabbath by eating a lollipop, and the result was that it stuck in his throat and choked him. He (Mr. S.) admitted the possibility of a little boy choking himself with a lollipop on any other day than Sunday, but still he could not help tracing in the choking an indirect punishment for breaking Heaven’s holy law.’

“We send abroad missions to convert the heathen. It would seem we have heathenism enough at home to occupy our thoughts.”

* * * * *

“It will be said that, by the very necessity of the case, the opening of these Institutions will compel some people to work upon the Sunday. I confess, Sir, that this seems to me an argument only adopted after the religious basis of Sabbatarianism is felt to be undermined. . . .

“In order that the majority may rest upon the Sunday, it is absolutely essential that a few should work, and the difference between me and the Sabbatarians upon this point is, that, while they would deliver over to endless labour those whom necessity prevents from having a day of rest on the Sundays, I, on the other hand, would, by the arrangement of a system of relays, provide that for the whole population there should be an occasional interval of rest.

“What will be the feeling of the working classes of this country if they learn that the House refuses their demand upon the ground that it will necessarily involve the labour of some? How is it with regard to our hon. House? How many men and women are there who have to labour every Sunday for our comfort, our enjoyment, and our luxury? I fear I should put it at a low estimate if I said three or four per head; at any rate it must be acknowledged to amount to a number that would suffice to open every museum and library in the country. It is said that a large number of cabs would be employed, but I remember not long ago there was a deputation to the Bishop of London, at which it was stated, I think, that there were 24,000 cabs employed every Sunday in conveying persons to church or chapel.

“I never heard a proposition that churches and chapels should be closed on that account. Perhaps, however, it may be said that attendance at these places is a work of piety or of necessity. This is really carrying class legislation into the affairs of another world. Why is the soul of a cabman to be imperilled in order that the stout wife of the greengrocer may be enabled to place an item to the credit of her heavenly account?

“But in every part of our life the labour which affects the interests of the rich is taken as a matter of course; it is only when the interests of the poor come into question that religious scruples arise between them and their enjoyment. I observe every Sunday, both here and at Brighton, numbers of men at work watering the roads, in order to prevent our houses and our clothing from being discoloured with dust: shall we refuse to open these Institutions to the people, which may prevent the clogging of their minds and souls with a deeper and more dangerous dust?

. . . . “My hon. friend will not deny the useful and elevating influence of museums and libraries upon the mind for six days in the week, apart from the question of the sanctity

of Sunday. . . . But, in fact, the intellectual advantage of such opportunities, and their purifying and elevating tendencies, are not only not a ground with the true Sabbatarians for opening these places on the Sunday, they are the very ground upon which they would most deprecate this liberty. . . . I find in an address at a meeting of the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of London, in the year 1852, the following passage in an address moved by Archdeacon Hale, and carried unanimously (referring to the Crystal Palace):—‘It is not, however, the gigantic character of the preparations which are making to draw myriads of people to one spot on the Lord’s Day which fills us with apprehensions of the demoralising effects of such an assemblage, but rather the intellectual character of the pursuits which we fear will there be offered to the public, and which, however they may refine the mind, teach nothing which relates to the Christian religion.’

“That is to say, in the opinion of these worthy Clergymen, the intelligence may be cultivated and the mind purified and elevated, and yet no step be made of approximation to their religion. Well, I say so much the worse for their religion! Sir, those to whom religion is not merely a bundle of dry dogmas, but the highest outcome and best fruit of the highest culture and intellectual advance that humanity is capable of, may be excused for answering such stuff as this by a paraphrase of the well known words of Madame Roland ‘Oh, religion! what blasphemy is uttered in thy name.’ But I must go one step further. Mere abstinence from ordinary toil, without any substitute or other relaxation or interest, is not, in the true sense of the word, rest at all, and still less can it be called recreation. It is inactivity and apathy, and I am inclined to think is actually more likely to produce a dangerous condition of immorality than even participation in the low sensual indulgence of the beer-house or the gin-shop.”

Having quoted a number of letters from provincial magistrates and gentlemen, stating the good results of the opening of museums and libraries in their own towns, and extracts from remarks by some of the London magistrates, naturally in the very best possible position to judge of such results, Mr. Taylor quoted the testimony of Sir J. Paxton, that the park at Chatsworth had been open to the public for about 100 years. About 1844 it was closed for a time. So soon as it was closed the people spent their time at the public-houses and created great disturbance. The park was opened again and such scenes ceased; two men are all that are required to look after it.

. . . "I must ask the House, is it consistent with statesmanship or with decency that, for the multitudinous population of this great city, there should be but one class of amusement and recreation open on the Sunday—the gin palace? I do not say this as an advocate for the closing of those places on a Sunday. . . . But I would not leave such places open alone. I would place by the side of them such institutions as would afford opportunities for higher and purer gratification."

* * * * *

"I am not going to draw any enthusiastic picture of gin-shops closed and churches filled, or of any sudden millennium, as the result of the adoption of this resolution; but this I say, that we can by such a vote give at once to thousands and tens of thousands of the people of this great city alone, new life, new objects, greater opportunities of cultivating their intelligence and of lifting themselves in the scale of being. There are thousands and tens of thousands to whom the advantage would be perhaps not less important—those who are trembling in the balance between good and evil, who are at present absorbed upon their only day of rest in the coarse and sensual enjoyment afforded by the gin palace, but many of whom, if offered the

choice of something better, would gradually shake off their low associations, and improve alike their minds and hearts. I do entreat the House to call down upon our heads the blessings of these not unimportant classes. . . . I ask this boon in the name of common sense and common justice, in the interests of intelligence and morality and, not less emphatically, in the interests of religion itself."

The motion was lost by 273 against 70.

Mr. Taylor brought forward a Resolution to the same effect as his former motion in June, 1877. He said that he had been asked to renew it by several bodies, and reminded the House that a great change had taken place in the opinion and feeling of the country, and even of religious people and the clergy. The observation of one clergyman was, "the clergy should occupy their proper position as leaders, and not merely spiritual relieving officers. It is high time beneficial reforms should be taken up by them, and not left to P. A. Taylor and Co. to inaugurate." He would with the greatest pleasure resign the leadership to the clergy, and was sure they would be within their position in doing what would be for the moral advantage of the people.

He was not urging the people to give up their day of rest; he was striving to make the day of rest more agreeable and improving. . . . All sorts of work was necessitated on Sundays. Our servants worked for us; public vehicles worked for us; railways worked for us; the machinists' department in many establishments worked; blast furnaces were necessarily kept alive in order that men might not be kept out of work on other days. All sorts of work were essential. What should be our aim? To make the work as little as possible, and to organise a plan by which those who work on Sunday should have one other day free from toil. Was there any other branch on which so few people would be employed as those in the British Museum to accommodate the thousands who would go there?

Mr. Taylor then told how the Queen had watched the men and women harvesting on a Sunday at Lochnagar Farm. All the villagers had turned out to obtain better results from the corn which was to make their bread, and the Queen expressed her approval. "We ask," said Mr. Taylor, "that a very few persons should be allowed to minister at the British Museum or National Gallery, in order to gather in a rich harvest for the intellect and imagination of the masses. . . ."

"In regard to the assertion that this is the thin edge of the wedge, that argument is too late by at least a century. The thin edge of the wedge has been put in many long years ago. We are told in the Records of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, under June 6th, 1658, that 'The same day Alexander Cairnie, in Tilliochie, was delaitit for brak of Sabbath in bearing ane sheep upon his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit that it was of necessitie for saving of the beast's life in tyme of storm. Was rebukit for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke.' Buckle, however, tells of worse than this. The clergy did not hesitate to teach the people that on that day (Sunday) it was sinful to save a vessel in distress, and that it was a proof of religion to leave ship and crew to perish. One of our more northern ministers, whose parish lies along the coast between Spey and Findhorn, made some fishermen do penance for Sabbath-breaking, in going out to sea, though purely with endeavour to save a vessel in distress by a storm. Cases of refusal to rescue vessels in danger, because of the day being the Sabbath, have occurred more than once in quite recent times."

With regard to the excellent effect produced upon the people by the few opportunities afforded them of innocent recreation of the kind he proposed, Mr. Taylor quoted the testimony of the officials of the museum galleries they were allowed to visit on Sundays, amongst others Dr. Hooker, of Kew, who "did not remember a single instance of

any one being turned out of the museums since their establishment nearly thirty years ago, yet they were often so densely crowded that it was difficult to move in them." Dr. Hooker added: "Not a year passes without my being warned of the advent of large and rough bodies of visitors from the east and south of London, who certainly do arrive after a very disorderly fashion, but who, on entering the grounds, often after a few exclamations of surprise, spontaneously assume a different demeanour and are reported by the police and patrols as having been samples that certain Saturday visitors might well imitate."

Mr. Taylor then read the following from a letter sent to him by the Rev. Septimus Hansard in reference to the humanizing effect of the spectacle of works of art upon the people :—

"In the month of November last 260,000 visitors, almost entirely of the humbler class of society, came to see the works of art in Bethnal Green Museum. The police and officers on duty there assure me that not a single person misbehaved him or herself. You never see any rudeness, nor hear any of the foul language of the street. In the face of what is beautiful the roughest is made gentle, his very language is purified, and his demeanour reverential. I have seen on week-day holidays men whom no sermons ever reach, and who have long since forgotten the Bible lessons of their childhood, gazing with wonder and interest, not unmixed with awe, on the pictures of great artists, representing some scene in the life of Christ. . . . On the day of the opening of our Bethnal Green Museum there must have been congregated in the streets of the east end of London nearly half a million of people, men, women, and children, and yet there was not a single case of drunkenness brought before the Magistrates the next day arising out of this event, and why? Because the people had something else to do and to look at and to amuse themselves with. I wish you would tell Sir Wilfrid

Lawson this. I am certain that a great proportion of drunkenness in the humbler classes is caused by their having nothing else to do on a holiday but to get drunk."

The last testimony in favour of his motion quoted by Mr. Taylor was from the Incumbent of the Bedfordbury Mission Church, St. Martin's in the Fields, who said: "As the clergyman of a very poor district, within one minute's walk of the National Gallery, I wish you success. It is a very rare thing for a family in my district to have more than one room for all domestic work. It is wicked indeed to refuse the people the use of a place like the National Gallery. . . . I wish Members of Parliament and other religious people who oppose your motion could spend one Sunday afternoon where I always spend mine, and I am sure they would vote at least for the opening of the National Gallery. What the people's rooms are on a wet Sunday, when they cannot break the Sabbath by walking in the parks, let medical men say."

Mr. Taylor said in conclusion: "I am struck with an impression almost of terror at the awful waste of human intellect and human enjoyment which is the result of our mode of dealing with Sunday. When you reflect that every man who lives to be seventy has passed ten whole years of Sundays, and that there are tens of thousands of workmen in our great towns who have no opportunity of study or culture, who perhaps have not half-a-dozen books to go to, and who are shut out from these centres of knowledge and intelligence, I say it strikes one with terror. . . . We are voting on a matter which interests, individually and personally, no single Member of the House, and I only say we should be very careful what decision we come to. It is a division of labour, and not one of a wholesome character. We, wealthy, and it is to be hoped, pious, pass a sort of self-denying ordinance, but those out of doors, away from us, and away from our vote, will suffer, not ourselves. . . . People oppose this motion as virulently and vehemently

as if you were going to pass a law to compel them to go to Museums and Picture Galleries. All we desire is to free those people who do desire to go from the inability to gratify themselves; and I do think it would not be more tyrannous to compel those to go who do not want to go, than to declare by law that those who do desire to avail themselves of the British Museum and other great collections shall not go. . . . If it be true that there is a section of Dissenters who are opposed to this motion, their conduct is most flagrantly inconsistent—to demand the separation of Church and State, and to say that they will not permit any bond of the State to interfere between them and their conscience, and then to say they will not allow the right of private judgment to those who differ from them. . . . It infringes the conscience of no man, except it be a conscience of that delicate texture which will not be satisfied unless it infringes on that right of private judgment in others which it demands for itself.”

On a division the motion was lost—the Noes being 231, the Ayes 89.

MR. TAYLOR AND THE VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION.

THE MUTINY ACTS.

THE first record of the help afforded by Mr. Taylor in Parliament to the work of the Vigilance Association appears in the Fourth Annual Report of the Association. The Committee had previously protested against the gradual introduction into the Mutiny Acts and Marine Mutiny Acts *

* The reader will remember that these Acts are annually passed.

of certain "vice-protecting clauses," by means of which every soldier and marine in the British service was expressly freed from all legal obligation to maintain any wife, child or other relative whom, but for such provision on the part of the War Office, he "might be compelled by law to relieve or maintain."

Early in 1872, the Vigilance Association had issued large numbers of circulars calling public attention to the subject, copies of which were forwarded to the members of both Houses of Parliament; and petitions, numerous signed, were sent up before the debate upon the Military Localisation Bill of that year. Certain amendments were introduced next session, but encumbered by such restrictions that, as Lord Salisbury remarked, "it might be that they amounted to a denial of the boon which Parliament would propose to grant;" and on the 16th April, 1873, when the Mutiny Bill went into Committee, Mr. Taylor objected to the conditions imposed upon the guardians of the parish if they should proceed against a soldier for deserting his wife. He stated that it was necessary for them to deposit £2, which, if the case were made out, they would only get back by very small instalments from stoppages from the soldier's pay, if the Secretary of State for War should order such stoppage; and, as he considered that the consent of the Secretary should not be required for the enforcement of this measure of justice, he moved that the word the Secretary of State *may* should be altered into *shall*. The amendment was lost. Mr. Taylor then moved the omission of the latter part of the clause which required that, should a summons under the Poor Law or Bastardy Acts be issued against a soldier or marine quartered at the time of issuing the summons in another petty sessional division from that in which the summons was issued, such summons should not be considered valid unless a sum of money should be deposited with the commanding officer sufficient to enable the soldier or marine to attend the hearing

of the case and to return to his quarters. This clause, as he pointed out, was a cruel hindrance in the way of a poor and deserted woman, since a wife could only proceed against the husband who had deserted her through the intervention of the Poor Law Guardians, who were not likely to advance the money for the purpose ; while the mother of an illegitimate child was usually poor and friendless, and without money to advance. Mr. Taylor added that one of the great dangers connected with a standing army was the danger of creating an isolated class in the community having different interests and a different standard of morality from the rest, and he appealed to the Government to carry out in the spirit the amendment which the late Government had only carried in the letter. That amendment was also lost. Both amendments were re-introduced by Mr. Taylor with equal ill-success in the three following sessions.*

Mr. Taylor also moved, year after year, for the omission from the Mutiny Bill of the flogging clauses (which were at last abolished on the motion of Mr. Otway) in June, 1875.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL.

DURING the same month Mr. Taylor delivered an exhaustive speech against the "Offences against the Person Bill," commonly known as the *Flogging Bill*. He showed that it was under the influence of a sudden panic in regard to a particular description of crime known as *garrotting* that "the House rushed into what might be called experimental legislation, although we had

* In the session of 1882, Mr. Taylor supported Mr. Sexton when he attempted once again to introduce amendments on the Army Annual Act to make soldiers equally responsible with civilians for the maintenance of their wives and children, but they were defeated by a majority of 15.

given up, it was hoped for ever, the practice of torturing our criminals. That experiment has failed as signally as did all the punishments of torture employed by our fathers before us; those punishments brutalized society, but they were not equally efficacious in stamping out crime." Mr. Taylor went on to show that since the abolition of flogging in the army the discipline of the army had not been lessened nor its strength impaired, and he added that in the days when he and Mr. Otway were struggling against flogging in the army, they did not expect to have the Government propose to organize and extend the torture of the "cat" as an ordinary punishment for crime. "Crimes of violence," Mr. Taylor said, "spring from a certain brutal element in society . . . nothing scarcely can be more unwise, more insane than to seek a remedy in punishments which inevitably tend to brutalize, not only the criminals, but the whole community, and thus add to the original cause of the mischief. . . . Sir John Bennett wrote to the *Times* that no sooner did it get abroad that the dreadful sentence of flogging was to be inflicted than he received innumerable applications from persons of every degree for an opportunity of witnessing this miserable spectacle." . . . "If there is one thing more cruel, more brutal, and more without excuse than the brutality of the individual criminal, is it not the act of society when it gets that criminal within its grasp? Society takes that friendless scoundrel by the throat. It has it in its power to do whatever it will with him; it can restrain him, it can shut him up for life, or until he has proved by good behaviour that he has some right to be at liberty; . . . and yet what does it do? It imitates upon him the brutality which the garrotter inflicted upon his victim. The lesson that society ought to teach him is, that he has committed a crime against humanity, but what it does say is, that it is right and just to do to him all and more than all that he did to his victim; it teaches

him, not that cruelty is an infamy, but that the motive, the object which he had in view, was wrong. Mark the lesson this gives to the brutal father who has disobedient children. Society cannot say obedience is not a good thing. How, then, shall he obtain this good thing? The right honourable gentleman teaches him, 'Let him beat them until he has forced them into submission.' Or a brutal husband has a drunken wife. Assuredly it is a good object to reclaim her, and prevent her from ruining herself and family. How shall the brutal husband effect this? The right honourable gentleman teaches him, 'Let him beat her till she cannot raise her hand to her head.'" . . .

"There is something to my mind infinitely mean and contemptible in this way of punishing our lowest class of criminals by brutal violence. Think what their lives and chances are! They are born, literally and morally, in an atmosphere of crime; they have no chance of raising themselves from what they are; they live in the midst of a public opinion that surrounds them and educates them in crime. . . . At last a wretch offends against the law, and thus society gains the opportunity to deal with him as it deems best. . . . We can bring our culture, our civilization, our religion to bear upon him, and, if possible, to reform him; and then, at this crisis of his fate, we prove the excellence of civilization, the beauty of culture, and the glory of religion by tearing his back with a cat-o'-nine tails." . . .

"What is there in these particular crimes of personal violence that makes flogging or other torture particularly applicable to them? . . . Other crimes argue at least as much selfishness in their perpetration, and their consequences are a thousandfold worse than individual attacks upon a particular man. Will you flog the fraudulent bank director who carries ruin into hundreds of peaceful homes? Will you flog the debaucher of children under ten years old? There are thousands of such cases; but, though

honourable members cry 'hear, hear,' I tell them that the House of Commons will never flog for such offences, because on the first cut of the lash touching the tender back of a gentleman the punishment will be swept away for ever."

It will be remembered that the Government withdrew the Bill.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN THE NAVY.

In July of the same year the Vigilance Association were able to give some support to a motion proposed by Mr. Taylor on the 13th of that month for the publication of Annual Reports on Crime and Punishment in the Navy, the publication of these having been stopped by Lord Hampton (then Sir John Packington), when First Lord of the Admiralty, on the ground that they were offensive to certain commanding officers. When Mr. Taylor called the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ward Hunt) to the withdrawal of these returns, that gentleman gave as reasons for it that they were expensive, and that no adequate advantage resulted from their presentation to the House. Mr. Taylor showed, however, that as the returns were regularly made to the First Lord, the cost of printing was the main expense involved in their presentation, and added, ". . . We expend ten millions yearly in caring for the welfare and strength of our navy, and cannot we afford a few hundreds or a few thousands in order to procure the means of testing what we are doing, which we wisely insist upon, in every other department of the State?" He showed also that in 1871 the number of desertions from the navy was 709, and that the offence was increasing yearly; that the cost of each man before he was trained to the service was £300 to £400; and that the country thus spent in making men able-bodied seamen from £200,000

to £300,000 per annum, and that no question of expense ought therefore to stand in the way of the fullest information being given to the representatives of the people as to the condition of these men; characteristically adding, that "if there were but two or three harshly treated men—and the influence of public opinion might have prevented their receiving that harsh treatment, these Returns would have been worth having." As to the publication being offensive to certain commanders, he said that "the fact that they were so should make those who have the real good of the navy at heart all the more desirous that they should be retained. The officers who do not like them would not be those who are attached to the service and care for their men—who maintain discipline and yet retain their men's affection and respect. Nor would it even be the rigid disciplinarians, because they have the respect of their men. It would be just those careless officers such as will ever creep into the best service—who alternate a gross laxity of discipline with a disgraceful severity of punishment. . . . Some people treat this subject as though one crew were composed of good men and another of bad, and as though it were a hardship to the officers in command of the latter to make public the state of discipline and the amount of punishment in their ships, seeing that these depended upon the character of the crew, and not upon the discretion and efficiency of the commander. But he thought he could show that the condition of a ship depends far more upon the officers in command than upon the character of the men sent to the vessel."

Having quoted the testimony of some of the best officers in the service in support of this view, Mr. Taylor added:—

"We have continual Returns upon all matters connected with crime and punishment in relation to our civilian population, and upon that we form our opinion of the good or evil

working of our laws, and of any need for alteration. But this is far more necessary in regard to our naval service in which discipline is still of the most tremendous and Draconian severity. It includes every punishment from a simple reprimand, and the discretion vested in the officer is of the most absolute description. Simple larceny may be punished by imprisonment for life; seventeen offences are punished by death; for penal servitude there is no limit. Thus, while under a good officer a ship may be a happy republic, or rather a paternal government, it is in the power of a tyrannical commander to make his ship a very hell. Nor is there any one to report these punishments or to call attention to them. Abroad there is no press dealing with these matters, and it must be remembered that by the Naval Discipline Act it is not merely naval crimes that are so dealt with. . . . Our naval officers, who are not trained lawyers, and usually know very little about law, have to decide a number of cases, not as in the army with the assistance of a Judge Advocate General, but by themselves, and as a consequence, men are, for instance, often illegally flogged. . . . Many ships were honourably distinguished by having no flogging on board during the year, while on one ship twenty per cent. of the whole crew were flogged in one year. We take the most elaborate pains to get trustworthy Health Returns from the Navy, and it surely is most essential that we should get also a Report of the state of crime and punishment. Where there is least crime and punishment, there we shall also find the least sickness; or, in the rough words of the sailors themselves, 'A big black-list make a big sick-list.'"

Mr. Taylor then moved that . . . "Returns as to the crimes and punishments in the navy should be annually presented to this House."

The motion was lost, and Mr. Taylor gave notice that he would propose it again in the next Session.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL. (No. 2.)

IN 1876, the member for Salford, Mr. Charley, introduced into the House of Commons a Bill bearing the title of the "Offences Against the Person Bill;" but, in fact, almost identical with the Infanticide Bill of the previous Session which the Vigilance Association had opposed. In the course of the debate upon this Bill, Mr. Taylor showed that it did not, as at first sight it appeared to do, mitigate the penalty for infanticide, for the capital character of that offence was specially retained in cases when murder, wilful or premeditated, was proved; and that it sought by establishing a lower penalty in cases where wilful murder could not be clearly brought home to the unhappy mother, to induce juries to bring in a verdict of guilty in cases where they would not otherwise do so. He also reminded the House that it was a fact recognised by competent medical authority, that women at other times sane, were frequently in an absolutely irresponsible condition of mind during labour and incapable of mental self-control. It was mainly through the persistent opposition of Mr. Taylor, seconded by Sir E. Watkin, that the Bill was withdrawn.

SPEECHES AT THE VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION.

MR. TAYLOR took the chair at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Vigilance Association (1878), and in his opening speech said: "In England we are too much accustomed to content ourselves with taking the question of personal rights for granted, with assuming that these rights have been won for us, once for all, by our forefathers, have been embodied in our institutions and will be maintained without further care or

trouble on our part. But . . . even when the laws are just and equal, great abuses are certain to creep into the administration of them unless vigilant watch be kept over their liberties by the citizens themselves. Moreover, our laws are still far from equal as between class and class, and are glaringly unequal . . . as between men and women. In support of this assertion I need not do more than allude to the primary injustice that women are denied their right to Parliamentary representation, to the existing oppressive legal restrictions upon the industry of women, to the gross inequality of the laws of property, and to the unjust and immoral Contagious Diseases Acts, perhaps the most infamous example on record of legislative violation of the most sacred of human rights. Apart from the numerous instances of derivative injustice necessarily resulting from the inequality of the law as regards the two sexes, and the abuse or violation of the law inevitable as long as the rights of any class of citizens are ignored, the examples of legal injustice to which I have alluded are alone sufficient to show how necessary it is that an Association like our own should exist, to labour for the abolition of laws pressing unfairly upon any class of society, however degraded; to enforce observance of the rights which are legally their heritage, in all cases in which they are too weak to protect themselves, and to forward by every lawful means in our power, new legislation based upon principles of equality and justice. . . . We claim for all men and women their personal and political freedom—their rights—in order that they may be able to fulfil their duties. As Mdlle. Mozzoni truly said in her speech at the Congress upon State-regulation of Vice recently held at Geneva, ‘the very idea of law implies responsibility;’ or, to quote the noble words of Joseph Mazzini, ‘the one, sole right of humanity is the right to the free and responsible fulfilment of duty.’ Those factory laws against which we have protested,—and shall again protest next session—and

indeed all laws restrictive of the industry of women violate this great principle, and by depriving them of the means of maintaining themselves with honour and dignity by the fruits of their own labour, drive them to seek their subsistence amid the degradation and misery of prostitution. The grave importance of this fact was strongly and repeatedly urged during the Congress of Geneva, to which I have alluded, by those delegates, from every country in Europe, who had most earnestly and practically devoted themselves to the study of the causes of prostitution, and of the best methods of preventing it. The irrevocable punishment of death, to which I am glad to find the Association opposed, is also a violation of the great principle asserted by Mazzini, inasmuch as it deprives him who had chosen evil of the possibility of redeeming himself by any future endeavour after good."

Mr. Taylor also took the chair at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Vigilance Association (1879), and, in his opening address, after commending the work of the Association during the past year, said that the Association might be said to be to members of Parliament "a sort of supplementary constituency—an added conscience. . . . The continual reference to the principles involved in the various Bills or legal cases which this Association takes up is peculiarly valuable. At the present time the great lack among the Liberal Party is an almost entire forgetfulness of first principles. We are so much absorbed by details, that we too often lose the sense of those principles by which those who came before us were more actuated than we are. And by adhesion to principle, I do not mean that a certain dogma is to be laid down, and that, disregarding all circumstances, it shall be forced forward and carried out at any cost or hazard. But I mean that whatever we have to do in detail should be referred to the moral and political principles in which we believe. To give an illustration, it used to be held

as a principle of our Constitution, and dear to the heart of every Englishman, that a man had an absolute right to liberty so long as he did not violate the rights of the Community. It was admitted that the individual might do many things which, being directly injurious to himself, might be indirectly injurious to society ; but it was generally acknowledged that it was, on the whole, as a matter of right and as a matter of policy, best for society that the principle of individual liberty should be held sacred. Now, some people have very grievously forgotten this in the matter of the liquor laws. It has been enough for them to know that too much liquor is consumed and they have forgotten that what a man shall eat or drink is a matter for himself to decide. This is not only the right principle, but it is, in the long run, the best policy for the country to adopt. Let us apply this principle to the Contagious Diseases Acts. People buried themselves in figures ; they took the report of doctors who held that legislation might, in some degree, alleviate the physical mischief produced by prostitution, and, with an utter disregard of justice, the personal rights of women were violated in a manner which, hundreds of years ago, would have led men to draw the dagger of Wat Tyler.

. . . Just one other illustration—take the franchise. We thought it was an accepted principle that a representative form of Government was the best ; that the ultimate appeal should be to the vote of the people ; yet when any question of the enlargement of the franchise comes up, whether in the case of men or women, no right is recognised, no such principle of representation is guaranteed. No one has ever supposed that ignorant people will vote as well as intelligent people ; but we have laid it down as a principle that, on the whole, the safest mode of educating the people is through acknowledging their right to representation. As Mr. Mill has said, ‘education flies over the heads of those who have neither interest nor responsibility in the Government of the State.’

Yet in the matter of representation, the same arguments are brought up now that were used in 1832, and we have to fight the same battle over again, as if we had no principle to guide us at all. This I take to be the worst form of democracy. It deprives us of all sense of security in the steps we have gained, and compels us, in the most revolutionary manner, to fight again for each detail of the question whenever it is raised."

COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

MR. TAYLOR's first speech against compulsory vaccination was upon the occasion of Dr. Cameron's resolution respecting Animal Vaccine, June 11, 1880.

The first proposition that he laid down was "that the less the State interferes with the home management of the various portions of the community, in regard to their habits, manners, and customs, the better both for the State and the people. It is not desirable that the doctrine fashionable for the time being among medical men should be forced upon an unwilling community. The opposite view of legislation has taken rather rapid strides of late years; and paternal legislation has spread to an extent which fifty years ago would have been repudiated by all classes of the community. In other words, the danger we have to meet at the present time is the danger that in our progress towards Democracy we may change the tyranny of the few to the tyranny of the many.

"There has been a sort of conspiracy of silence, especially among the Press upon this subject. The great London daily Press deny access to their columns of any discussion upon the matter. We have, therefore, the orthodox theories of the great daily Press of the country on one side, and on the other the special organs of the anti-vaccinators. It is evident that in such a condition of things there is no scientific discussion of

the question whatever. The most monstrous facts are asserted, the most absurd conclusions suggested, and the most ridiculous deductions in consequence of this enforced silence pass current with everybody. . . .

“Nor is it at all fair as regards the medical profession that this secrecy should be maintained. They have their interests and their prejudices like any other members of the community, and we know that the medical men of this country do not fairly represent the facts in respect to vaccination to the community. . . . I take it from their own lips. Mr. Henry May, Health Officer to the Aston Union, Birmingham, in an article on certificates of death, said—

“‘In certificates given by us voluntarily, and to which the public have access, it is scarcely to be expected that a medical man will give opinions which may tell against or reflect upon himself in any way, or which are likely to cause annoyance or injury to the survivors. In such cases he will most likely tell the truth, but not the whole truth, and assign some prominent symptom of the decease as the cause of death. As instances of cases which may tell against the medical man himself, I will mention erysipelas after vaccination, and puerperal fever. A death from the first cause occurred not long ago in my practice; and although I had not vaccinated the child, yet, in my desire to preserve vaccination from reproach, I omitted all mention of it in my certificate of death.’

“Though such a state of things is dangerous, it would also be comical if it were not too serious to be comic. A child at Leeds died recently from the results of vaccination as was distinctly borne witness to by the surgeon who attended it. The Coroner, also a medical man, and one who respected the rights of vaccination, declined to take as a verdict that the child died from vaccination, and said there was no such thing known to the law as a death from vaccination. In fact, according to him, the poor child had committed an offence against the laws of this country in venturing to die from

vaccination, and so a jury returned as their verdict, 'Died by the visitation of God.' Now, granting all that the vaccinators believe, and all that they say, nevertheless compulsory vaccination is wrong, tyrannous, and impolitic. No one will maintain, Sir, in the first place, that the State has a right of insisting that a child shall be vaccinated for the sake of the child itself. The parent has at least a *prima facie* right to decide upon the risks that the child shall run, and there can be no right in the State to insist upon vaccination, except as a matter of national interest and protection. . . . This demand for compulsion has come upon the country just in proportion as vaccination has been proved to have failed. Jenner declared that vaccination was a perfect protection against small-pox, and nobody dreamed of making it compulsory. If it be necessary in the interests of the State to enforce vaccination, then it should be enforced upon all. To enforce it upon the poor only is simply an infamy. If it is so essential to public health that every child should be vaccinated, the State is bound to take the infant from its mother's breast, and, with the policeman's baton, to force the parents to allow a surgeon to vaccinate the child. Will the House of Commons do this? No, the House of Commons will not dare to do it. And yet to inflict compulsion upon the poor, and to persecute them as they are being persecuted now by fines, because they will not do that which other people in the upper and middle class, aye, and members of this House will not do, is alone enough to stamp the present system as an enormous evil. Is there not something touching in the report of a trial of a poor man for not having his child vaccinated? He was convicted of the offence, and these were his last words before he went to prison—'Lock me up, gentlemen, I will not pay; I swore on my dead child's body that I would not.' Have we come to such a condition of things in this free country of ours, that we can look with satisfaction or indifference on a man having to utter such

a sentence as that in a British Court of Justice? . . . At this moment there is a person living at Farringdon, who has just suffered his 32nd prosecution because he will not have that done to his child which he believes to be a danger and an injury. . . . I do not ask the hon. gentleman to pay any attention to my opinion. . . . Even granted that all that the vaccinators say is true, it is an unwise and tyrannous system. . . . I am struck by the fact that if you ask about its efficacy you are met by two things. You are treated to doubtful tradition in the past; and you are not treated to the positive failures of the present. The broad statement everybody makes is, that there can be no question in the matter. Before vaccination was discovered, they say, this country and the world at large was desolated with the small-pox; the few who survived had their faces fearfully seamed with the hideous marks of the disease. Now, there is remarkably little known about the statistics of small-pox in former times. Until the year 1837, there was no authentic system of registration in this country. There are the most various kinds of stories as regards the people in the last century being so dreadfully marked with the small-pox. Many of my friends tell me, 'I never see it now. In my youth everybody had it, and all their faces were hideously seamed with small-pox.' That proves a great deal too much. Compulsory vaccination can not have done away with that, because that was only established comparatively, in 1854, and absolutely in 1868. Therefore, amongst all persons in the country above 30 years of age, there should be a due proportion of hideously-seamed faces. But, if hon. Members study the history of the medical treatment of small-pox in the last century, they will be surprised that anyone who took it ever recovered, or, if they did recover, that they should have recovered without hideous marks. The infallible doctors of that day placed the unhappy patients in a hot room, with every door and window

closed, with enormous fires made, with the clothes heaped upon them, which, in order to increase the effect, were coloured red, and they refused the patient any drop of cooling drink. That was what the infallible doctors did in the last century. Now, in reference to the enormous fatality of small-pox in the last century, Dr. Farr says:—‘ Small-pox attained its maximum mortality after inoculation was introduced.’* Inoculation, in the last century, was the pet of the infallible profession.

“ After the beginning of this century the deaths from small-pox still decreased, although the vaccination of the people at that time was probably not 1 per cent., and could have no influence whatever upon the rates of mortality. The vaccinating prophets of the present day, however, declare that it was vaccination which produced the diminution at the beginning of the century. The whole thing is absolutely a foregone conclusion. If there happens to be no epidemic, the vaccinators triumphantly say that they have stamped it out—as from time to time they have declared it stamped out in Ireland, in Sweden, and in Germany. But small-pox, like all other zymotic diseases, comes in epidemics. The population begin to die, and then the vaccinators fall back upon some excuse, always taking care that it is consistent with the fundamental assertion that vaccination stops the small-pox. Sometimes they have bad lymph; sometimes they have not enough marks! Not enough marks! Jenner declared that one mark was as good as any other number. . . . Yet, there can be no doubt that people die from small-pox after they have been vaccinated. Then the cry is, re-vaccinate them. If vaccination twice in life does not do, why, then

* “ The annual deaths from small-pox from 1760 to 1779, were, on an average, 2,323. In the next 20 years—1780-1799—they declined to 1,740. The disease, therefore, began to grow less fatal *before* vaccination was discovered.”

vaccinate early, and vaccinate always? Vaccinate once, at least, every seven years, we are told; and a gentleman wrote to the papers, the other day, actually to recommend that persons should be vaccinated every three years! In fact, the unhappy man spends his life in a perpetual condition of cow-pox in order to escape the small-pox! One of the alleged reasons for the failure of vaccination as a protection is that bad lymph is used; and, in fact, Dr. Cameron makes use of that very assertion as a reason for having new and fresh lymph from the cow. His words are—in a letter to *The Times*: ‘The recurrence, therefore, in the latest period of mortality, almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act, shows either that the protective virtues of vaccination are mythical, or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of vaccination.’

“On the other hand, another great authority, Dr. Stevens, speaking at the Medical Conference, said:—‘He had seen more vaccinated children than any man, either alive or who had lived, and all his experience led him to the opinion that the arm-to-arm system practised in this country was as nearly perfect as a system could be made, and as efficacious as could be desired.’

“But how, then, are all the deaths after vaccination to be accounted for? According to the Report of the Local Government Board, the deaths in London from small-pox in 1871 were 7,912, of whom 2,580 had been vaccinated. Then where is your protection? In 1870, 1871, and 1872, again, the total deaths from small-pox in England and Wales were 44,840! Be it remembered that this was at a time when 90, 95, and even 97 per cent. of the people were vaccinated. All this time there was this sad increase in the deaths from small-pox in epidemic after epidemic. What is the answer to these figures, coupled with the fact that for years everybody has been vaccinated? The Local Government Board declares that—‘No case of small-pox has come

within the cognizance of the medical superintendents of any person who has been efficiently vaccinated and successfully re-vaccinated,' which is only another way of saying that if they have the small-pox, vaccination has not been satisfactorily or efficiently done, and that really is the only test these medical men vouchsafe to us.

" Like all the rest of the world, Dr. Cameron cannot believe that vaccination is a myth, and so he takes us as a remedy to lymph, fresh and pure from the cow. Dr. Seaton, the medical officer of the Local Government Board, in precisely the same spirit of assuming that vaccination is an absolute protection, and then making all the facts bend to his theory, deals in the same way with the late tremendous epidemic in which upwards of 44,000 people lost their lives. All he said was :—' Except for vaccination this epidemic would *presumably* have caused such frightful and demoralizing mortality as the worst pestilences of past centuries.'

" But now, supposing that vaccination instead of being a protection, actually inoculates with small-pox. If there be any theory at all in connection with vaccination—I take it to be that small-pox and cow-pox are diseases of a similar type, and that if a man takes the milder disease of the same type it will protect him, at slight inconvenience, from the more dangerous form of the disease. Therefore, when the theory of the bad lymph began to be prevalent it was thought desirable that fresh lymph should be prepared from a cow inoculated with small-pox. Accordingly, Mr. Badcock inoculated cows with small-pox, vaccinated more than 14,000 persons from the lymph so obtained, and supplied more than 400 doctors. He says:—' I had by careful and repeated experiments produced, by the inoculation of the cow with small-pox, a benign lymph of a non-infectious and highly protective character.' (A benign lymph! One is inclined to rush off and be vaccinated on the spot.) ' The experiments, of which this was the result, were conducted by me during 18

years with extreme care at a great sacrifice of time and money, and with important results. My lymph has now been in use at Brighton for 40 years, and is at the present time the principal stock of lymph employed there, being that exclusively used by the public vaccinators.'

"Now, what does Dr. Cameron say to Mr. Badcock, and his spreading throughout the country this benign lymph? With unwonted severity he writes to *The Times* that . . . 'more recent and searching experiment has demonstrated that it is not vaccine lymph at all, but small-pox lymph capable of being inoculated apparently with greater safety to the individual than ordinary small-pox, but, like the mildest inoculated small-pox, capable of propagating that disease in its most virulent form by infection.'

"The members of the Galway Board of Guardians were so much impressed with this 'benign lymph,' that they suggested that a calf should be inoculated in this way. But the Local Government Board of Dublin interposed, and wrote, 'Small-pox virus, taken from a calf, would communicate that disease to a human subject, and be thereby a fertile source of propagating the disease. . . . Vaccination performed with lymph taken from a cow which has been vaccinated with human lymph is not reliable.'

"But for this flood of light thrown in upon us in reference to this matter, I should have been much astonished by a letter I received from Mr. Lewis, of Ipswich, who writes, 'I have made many inquiries in various parts of England, and I have invariably found that, whether in town or village, when the small-pox commenced it began with a vaccinated person. This was so in Ipswich, Coddendam, Preston, Liverpool, Stockport, &c. At Chatham it began with the re-vaccinated soldiers.'

"Yet the medical profession have been compelling people to use this stuff all this time. But what if, beyond this, vaccination actually produces in the human frame other diseases

than those incidental to vaccination or small-pox? It is an undeniable fact, known to every medical man in Europe at this time, that it has communicated the most frightful diseases. I was astonished to hear my hon. friend refer to those 500 answers* declaring it impossible, because it is no great credit to the medical profession, and shows that they are apt to follow where they are led, like a flock of sheep. Ten years ago, the medical profession was pledged to the belief that syphilis could not be communicated by vaccination. All these 500 men pledged themselves to the truth of this assertion. Sir Thomas Watson, indeed, distinctly advises a return to calf lymph, in order to avoid the 'ghastly risk' of infection from arm-to-arm vaccination; while Dr. Wilson, officer of health to the Alton Union, in a recent number of *The Lancet*, says, 'It is useless to deny that vaccination by human lymph involves danger of scrofulous, syphilitic, and erysipelatous inoculation. The difficulty of securing with absolute certitude subjects for furnishing vaccine lymph free from constitutional taint is simply insuperable, as few—rather I would say no scientific physiologist, no thoughtful medical practitioners of widespread experience, contest.'

"Dr. Ballard, who is a very high authority on this subject, in his prize essay on vaccination, published in 1868, closes his comments on the series of vaccine syphilizations, known as the Rivalta series, which occurred in May and June, 1861, with these words:—'Among the 39 infected from Chiabrera was Louisa Manzone (the second vaccinifer of the series). She was aged six months. On the tenth day, again, she was used for the vaccination of 17 other children, of whom seven became affected with syphilis, suffering in the same manner as the 39 infected from Chiabrera. Two months afterwards she was taken to Acque, and seen, by Dr. Sylventi, who recognised upon her a syphilitic eruption, with mucous

* From medical men officially questioned on the subject.

tubercles about the arms and vulva, mucous patches on the commissures of the lips, and indolent glandular enlargements, the primary affection at the seat of the vesicles not even being healed. The child died in September. The nurse who suckled her got ulcers on the breast, and from the various other children who were syphilized, the disease spread by contagion to 18 mothers and nurses and to three other children.'

"This is only one of several similar outbreaks quoted by Dr. Ballard, and this was all kept a secret! Not a word of it was known for six years. . . . Many years ago M. Ricord, the famous French surgeon, said:—'The obvious fact is that, if ever the transmission of disease with vaccine lymph is clearly demonstrated, vaccination must be altogether discontinued.' I do say that it is a disgrace to attempt, in face of these facts, to continue compulsory vaccination.

"The late Dr. Schiefferdecker, of New York, declared—
'1. That it is not true that vaccination is a preventive of small-pox. 2. That cow-pox virus is as decided a poison as that taken from the small-pox patient. 3. That vaccination propagates a variety of other diseases more fatal than small-pox—such as scarlet fever, croup, typhoid fever, scrofula, consumption, syphilis, cancer, tuberculous formations, diphtheria, &c.,' in which opinion Dr. W. H. Weaker coincided, and the well-known Herr Kolb, of Munich, says that—'In well-vaccinated Bavaria, famous for compulsion, out of 30,742 cases in 1871, 29,429 were supplied by the vaccinated.'

"The evidence of Dr. Collins, M.D., who was examined before the Committee in 1871, was that 'he had ceased to vaccinate 10 or 12 years. Had known persons who had been vaccinated and re-vaccinated suffer dreadfully from small-pox, two of whom died of the most hideous confluent form, after successful vaccination and re-vaccination; one of them three times vaccinated. Had vaccinated thousands, but at last abandoned the practice, and gave up at least £500 a

year by so doing. Had found that cow-poxing weakened the powers of vitality and often proved fatal.'”

Mr. Taylor here read to the House the statistics prepared by Dr. Keller (Medical Head of the Austrian Railway System) concerning the effects of small-pox among the Railway employés and their families during the epidemic of 1872-3. The total number of persons upon whom the average was formed was from 55,000 to 60,000. The tables were strikingly in favour of the unvaccinated. Mr. Taylor also quoted the details forwarded by Professor Germann, M.D., of the Leipsic University to the German Diet concerning the syphilization by vaccination of eighteen school-girls at Lebus (Frankfort on the Oder) and the similar infection of twenty-nine children at Castiglione d'Orcia (Siena) by cow virus officially forwarded from Rome, as related in the *Gazetta d'Italia* (May, 1871).*

“My hon. friend has talked like other ardent vaccinators about pure lymph; but he has never told us what pure lymph is. The inoculation of a cow with small-pox, he absolutely objects to. What will he say when I assert—and it is maintained by good authority—that there is no such thing known as spontaneous cow-pox in the cow. It is absolutely certain that Jenner said, and always believed, that cows were inoculated from a diseased horse. But spontaneous cow-pox! There is no such thing. Sometimes little bits of news come in from foreign sources which we should never get if the things occurred at home. In *The Daily News* for May 25 there is this paragraph—‘In *The Voltaire* a Dr. Bremond takes credit for ‘being the first to announce that there is now in Paris a diseased horse from whose leg may be taken pus as efficacious for vaccinator purposes as the lymph habitually used. This discovery is a mare’s nest. No scientific fact is more certain than that

* Those interested in the question may obtain the full report of Mr. Taylor’s speech at 114, Victoria Street, S.W.

Jenner's cows, who accidentally vaccinated milkmaids, themselves caught a disease from rugged horse-boys' hands after they had stroked down greasy-heeled horses. There is not to be found in the whole world a cow with natural cow-pox.'

"Where, then, is this pure lymph to be got? Not from the small-pox, not from natural cow-pox, for there is no such thing known. The course they pursue in Paris, in order to obtain pure calf lymph is thus explained by the correspondent to whom I have referred:—'The owners of heifers in Paris who make a rich harvest by advertising vaccination direct from the cow, blink the fact that their beasts are all vaccinated from the more or less wholesome arms of children.'"

(Dr. Cameron here said that there were an immense number of cases, thoroughly well authenticated, of spontaneous cow-pox recorded in, amongst other publications, "The Manual of Vaccination," and Mr. P. A. Taylor referred him upon that point, to his great prophet, Dr. Jenner, who distinctly asserts in his "Inquiry" that the "pustulous sores which frequently appear spontaneously on the nipples of cows" are different in nature "from that contagion which constitutes true cow-pox.")

"*The Lancet* in respect to the safety of animal lymph (June 22, 1878), says—'The notion that animal lymph would be free from chances of syphilitic contamination is so fallacious that we are surprised to see Dr. Martin, of Boston, U.S. (the great advocate of calf lymph) reproduce it,' and Dr. Seaton, who is a great authority, says 'The difficulties of applying such a plan to the vaccination of the general population are, I apprehend, quite insuperable. . . . So far from being likely to produce fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed, Mr. Ceely—and there is no one who has nearly the knowledge that he possesses of the disease in the cow, and of its transplantation to the human species—says, he knows from his experience that it would produce more.'"

"Now, Sir, I protest against the House passing a compul-

sory law that children, willy-nilly, are to be vaccinated from cows, wholesome or diseased as the case may be ; and I somewhat confidently assert that after the facts and statements I have brought forward, I have come to a very mild conclusion in the Amendment that I have now to propose, the purport of which is—‘That, in the present unsettled condition of medical opinion in regard to the safety of using ordinary humanised lymph, as also of the safety, effectiveness and practicability of the use of animal vaccine, it is in the opinion of this House inexpedient and unjust to enforce vaccination under penalties upon those who regard it as unadvisable or dangerous.’ I say, Sir, that this is a mild conclusion, and that I might have gone much further, and have asked the House to affirm that compulsory vaccination is a disgrace to our jurisprudence and a shameful intrusion upon the rights of personal liberty.”

Mr. Taylor spoke again on compulsory vaccination, June, 1883. He said that a more important question could not possibly come before the House, whether as a question of individual right against medical tyranny, or as a question of national health—because it could no longer be denied that there was the possibility of the accumulated corruptions of our ancestors being transmitted to the coming generation—or whether in view of the extreme suffering and wrong done to individual protestors against this law. . . .

“There have,” added Mr. Taylor, “actually been cases where magistrates have asked a father objecting to vaccination whether he has lost any of his children through it, because otherwise they could not entertain his objection. They may indeed be said to out-Heroding Herod, and cutting off the first-born to save the lives of the remainder. . . . I sat on the Select Committee of 1871 upon these laws ; I entered that Committee with that traditionary conviction that ninety-nine men out of a hundred still have, that vaccination was a matter of course ; that nothing could be said

against it. I signed that report which defended the excellence of vaccination and its safety. I did not, however, support the right of compulsion. . . . Having committed myself to sign that report, it became a matter of conscience with me. I had done my little best to endorse and to maintain the excellence of vaccination. I was led by my political objection to compulsion to look more and more into the medical and scientific side of the question, and I was at length brought to the conclusion, to my great surprise, that vaccination was an absolute delusion, a positive superstition, an unscientific error, and an utter failure from the very first. It became, therefore, my clear duty to devote myself to the solution of this question, and to atone for the mistake into which I had, through ignorance, fallen, by proclaiming the truth where I had endorsed the error; nor will I cease my humble exertions until this law is removed from the Statute Book." . . .

Mr. Taylor quoted the evidence of Dr. G. F. Kolb, a distinguished German, Member Extraordinary of the Royal Statistical Commission of Bavaria, saying:—"From childhood I had been trained to look upon the cow-pox as an absolute and unqualified protective. I had . . . believed in it more strongly than in any clerical tenet or ecclesiastical dogma. . . . The question of vaccine compulsion came before the Reichstag, when a medical friend of mine supplied me with a mass of pro-vaccination statistics, in his opinion conclusive and unanswerable. This awoke the statistician within me. On inspection I found the figures were delusive, and a close examination left no shadow of doubt in my mind that the so-called statistical array of proof was a complete failure."

"Dr. Vogt, also, Professor of Hygiene and Sanitary Statistics in Berne, and probably the largest collector of statistical information in the world, examined the figures, firmly believing that they would confirm his conviction of

the value of vaccination; he registered and abstracted the particulars of the deaths of 400,000 cases of small-pox, but finally admitted that his belief in vaccination was absolutely destroyed. Dr. Böing, a distinguished German physician, set himself to prove the value of vaccination, but candidly says: 'No one can lament more than I do that the results of investigation should fall out in disfavour of compulsory vaccination. It is certainly not pleasant to be obliged to change one's convictions on so important a subject, and it is the more painful because it involves the relinquishment of a legislative measure, by means of which we believed ourselves able to cope with one of the most fearful scourges of human society.'"

Mr. Taylor went on to say "that the question divided itself into two portions—vaccination and compulsion. Even were vaccination all that its defenders maintained, he should object to compulsion on the ground of its invasion of the sacred right of the parent, of the right of individual liberty, at the bidding of medical supervision. It amounted to the State declaring that families shall not choose their own medical men. There were plenty of medical men opposed to vaccination, and yet if such a man entered a family and gave his advice against vaccination, the State declared that the parent should not have the right of taking such advice." Having related an instance of this in the case of a gentleman who was able to pay the fine imposed upon him, Mr. Taylor said: "But in the case of a poor man, the decision of the magistrate would have sufficed to condemn the child perhaps to death. Secondly, he objected to compulsion *ex hypothesi*—on the very ground on which it is defended—it was proved to be not needful. The only plausible ground for State intervention was the safety of the community. It was said that an unvaccinated child is a source of danger to the public. How could it be so, if everybody could be protected who desired to be? When, therefore, they call the unvacci-

nated child a centre of danger and disease to the whole protected community, it was an insult to the common sense of Englishmen. He should object to compulsion, even if he believed in vaccination, as highly impolitic, because the enforcement of any particular medical system, even if the best ever invented, would be sure to create many opponents. It was the business of those who believed in vaccination, in pure lymph, in careful operation, and so forth, to bring all these things freely to the homes of the poor, and not to make them antagonistic to their favourite system by compulsion.

Further, he objected to compulsion as a flagrant illustration of class legislation—as a flagrant case of oppression of the poor. The wealthy and well-to-do did not suffer from these laws. At the worst they had to pay a fine, which was nothing to them, and in nine cases out of ten, or in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the courtly medical man does not trouble his client with more than a simple remonstrance. That was not the case with the poor. They could not afford to pay the fine. They were sent to prison. If he could compress into a few sentences the numberless letters he had received of complaint and indignation, some of them accompanied with hideous photographs of mutilated infants dying from the infliction, it would prove the most powerful argument he could produce. In the case of the poorest of the poor—the inmates of our workhouses—the surgeon and the policeman carry on their campaign unchecked. There, said Mr. Taylor, hundreds of new-born infants were operated upon as well as the mothers, immediately after their confinement. A witness at an inquest the other day said he had vaccinated 1,500 women in that condition; it was said that they did not object. They did not object! No; the order is made to a woman probably only half-conscious of what is going on around her, ‘Strip your arm,’ and the operation is performed upon a patient who is declared to have given her consent. Does it not make one’s blood boil

merely to hear of such doings in a civilized country? May I ask what hon. members of this House would say if their wives were to be ordered to be vaccinated on the day of, or the day after their confinement?

“ It is often said that abstract assertions about individual liberty must not be allowed to stand in the way of saving the thousands of lives who would otherwise perish of this terrible disease; but it is a curious and well-recognised fact, that the mortality caused by small-pox cannot be regarded as an addition to the average mortality of the community, seeing that the years when most perish under small-pox epidemic are not the years of largest general mortality. The reason is obvious; one zymotic disease succeeds another, and the most deadly of them is not small-pox. Dr. Farr, in his letter to the Registrar-General on the causes of death in England, well expressed this idea in these words:—‘ To operate on mortality, protection against *every one of the fatal zymotic diseases* is required, otherwise the suppression of one disease opens the way to others.’

“ A wild suggestion has lately been thrown out, indeed, by M. Pasteur, proposing to inoculate, as in the case of small-pox, the poison-matter of every zymotic disease, by way of safeguard to the health of the community, a scheme which would transform the country into one huge hospital. Less, perhaps, than at any other time can the demand for compulsion be maintained now, because a wiser and truer school of medical science has arisen of late years, which preaches the advantages of sanitation. Dr. Richardson, Dr. Alfred Carpenter, Mr. Lawson Tait, of Birmingham, and others, not adverse to vaccination, declare that vaccination never can stamp out small-pox, but that small-pox, and all other zymotic diseases, can, may, and shall be stamped out by sanitation.” . . .

Mr. Taylor admitted that he had no hope of converting “ the small body of highly paid medical gentlemen who sit behind

the throne of the President of the Local Government Board, and who are more powerful on these matters than is the President of the Board himself. No doubt they were honourable and intelligent men, but they were men whose *raison d'être* was vaccination, and they could no more be expected to question its excellence than could the bench of bishops to question the Thirty-nine Articles. . . .

"Many years ago Dr. Ballard wrote that 'there were numerous cases on record to prove that vaccine virus and syphilitic virus may be introduced at the same spot by the same puncture of the vaccinating lancet.' Mr. Taylor having quoted the evidence of Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson, Mr. J. Brindley James (Public Vaccinator), and Dr. Warlemont, the late eminent director of the Belgian Government Animal Vaccine Department, to show that the syphilitic poison could not be detected, as "a vaccine vesicle highly syphilised presented an appearance perfectly irreproachable," said:—"There could be no doubt that it was owing to this circumstance that the French Government distinctly exculpated the military surgeon at Algiers who infected and practically ruined by vaccination fifty-eight unfortunate recruits.

"But it is not only over the President of the Local Government Board that this board of experts exercises so powerful an authority. They command the press—the medical press absolutely, and to a prodigious extent the lay press also, especially in London. They send articles to the great London journals, and by the help of the editorial 'we,' they teach the public to believe that the credit of vaccination is only impeached by—to use their favourite phrase—'half-a-dozen fanatics.' " . . .

"Does it not on the first view strike the House as an astounding theory to inoculate with disease every human being that comes into the world, in order to protect it from a worse form of that disease? especially as vaccination is no longer regarded as a quite unimportant and harmless affair,

but to quote the words of Dr. Ballard, must, in order to be effective, be 'a real and absolute disease;' and it is now admitted by the faculty, that it is perfectly impossible to test what they call the purity of the lymph by either chemical or microscopic test; that the healthiness—as they are pleased to term it—of the lymph employed can only be determined by the result produced. You see a little coffin, and discover that the lymph was deadly. . . .

"I have not, perhaps, so high an opinion of Dr. Jenner as many entertain, but I do give him credit to the extent of believing that he would have recognized the utter failure of his theory could he have foreseen that in an epidemic (1871-2), when it is boasted that at least ninety per cent. of the population had been vaccinated, there died of small-pox in England and Wales 44,840 persons. Or again, when it is admitted that in the Metropolitan Hospitals in that same epidemic, out of 14,803 small-pox patients, 11,174 had been vaccinated, and probably many more. . . .

"Dr. W. B. Carpenter, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, expressly explains and apologises for the enormous mortality by small-pox in the last epidemic, by saying that it was such a severe one!" . . .

Having laid before the House a comparison between "the real history of vaccination and the current tradition and given statistical proofs* that the mortality from small-pox had risen since the passing of the first compulsory Act," Mr. Taylor said: "Some 150 years ago, inoculation, the parent of vaccination, was in full blast in this country. Some 40 years ago it was made a misdemeanour to practice inoculation. . . . Let us, I implore the House, at once and for ever abolish the hateful tyranny of compulsion."

Sir Charles Dilke, Dr. Cameron, and Dr. Lyon Playfair,

*For these and the medical evidence quoted by Mr. Taylor against vaccination, the reader is referred to the full reports of his speeches on the subject, which may be had at 114, Victoria Street, London, S.W.

having spoken in opposition to Mr. Taylor's motion against compulsion, and Mr. Taylor having replied, the House divided, and Mr. Taylor's motion was lost.

We have said that Mr. Taylor has become known to the House of Commons and the public as "the Redresser of unheeded wrongs." The following instance of one of the methods by which he has earned the title is appropriate here.

On the 27th July, 1882, Mr. Taylor asked the Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) "whether Mr. James Burman, of Derby, who had been sentenced to seven days' imprisonment for refusing to have his child vaccinated, was compelled to sleep on a plank bed, was refused sufficient clothing by day to prevent his suffering from cold, and was compelled to pick oakum, although hard labour was not a part of the sentence."

It is almost needless to say that Mr. Taylor received the usual official reply. Sir William Harcourt had inquired into the case and found that "nothing was done which was not in strict accordance with the prison rules."*

Fortunately Mr. Taylor is one able "greatly to find quarrel with a straw when that straw implies a principle." He obtained counsel's opinion on the subject, which was as follows :—

"I think Mr. Burman is entitled to maintain an action for the cutting of his hair, and being forced to pick oakum; and, probably, for being obliged to wear the prison dress. There seems to be no justification for the two former acts, and the regulations of 1865 implicitly recognize the right of a prisoner for debt to wear his own clothes. It may be a question whether the amount of resistance was such as to render the

* This point is very noteworthy. Among the objections raised by the Vigilance Association to the Prisons' Act of 1877 was the monstrous power given by that Act to the authorities of the prison to "make rules" to which the simple approval of "a Secretary of State" gives the force of law.

acts assaults, but I think slight evidence should be sufficient in the case of a person under duress as he was."

Proceedings were taken against the Governor of Derby Gaol ; and finally the authorities were compelled to succumb, and in the last week of January, 1883, to pay to Mr. Burman £20 for compensation, as well as the costs of the action.

CONSTANCY TO PRINCIPLE.

ADDRESS OF MR. TAYLOR TO HIS CON- STITUENTS (SEPT., 1881).

" I must make one little digression to point out that departure from principle—the adoption of principle only when it suits our own views,—is one of the prevailing evils of this country, one of the weaknesses of the Liberal party. People who act thus do not understand what is the meaning of a principle. If you talk of acting upon principle they think you mean a certain fad that you have had accumulating in your mind, which has nothing to do with practice, and which prevents various practical measures being carried. No view could be more shallow. Principle is the concentrated essence of experience and of practice. By principle we mean, not the avoidance of that which is practical and actual, but we mean that on which the practical and actual is based. For instance we say we are in favour of universal suffrage. Well, everybody is in favour of that now, you know. They tell us people are uneducated and ignorant, but what do we say? We say that the experience of the world shows that giving the suffrage is the safest mode of diminishing that ignorance; we say that under all conditions it is the natural way of helping people; if they make mistakes, let experience, the habit of thinking and working for themselves, teach them,

and therefore, when we are told that if we give universal suffrage, you take it as a fad of ours, regardless of the immediate mischief that may be done, I repudiate that altogether; and assert that you are doing evil that good may come, for you are trying to get a little present good at the expense of the principle which you sacrifice. I was driven to this line of thought by a letter received the other day. I am a member of various associations all having for their purpose the maintenance and assertion of individual liberty and personal right. I belong to one society which is called the Vigilance Association for the Defence of Personal Rights, which embraces all questions which come under that category within its limits. I belong to other societies which only illustrate the general principle by some particular question with which it is involved; as, for instance, an association against Compulsory Vaccination; and another against the Contagious Diseases Acts. A friend wrote to me, and said, 'You are wasting time, energy and means; why do you have all these separate associations? Join some general association, and then you will save much expenditure of money and energy, and your agitation will be more effective. It sounded plausible enough, and I thought about it; but I had to reply to him: 'I am sorry to tell you that the majority of us who fight under this standard, and claim individual liberty and personal right against either a Government, a minority or a majority, for the most part only mean that we uphold individual liberty when it leads to conclusions with which we agree.' Thus we have men who talk loudly enough of personal right, but who, under terror of small-pox, approve and uphold the shameful tyranny of Government compulsory vaccination. We have men, loud in their talk of personal liberty, who, for some crook in their minds, uphold the still more evil and degrading legislation of the Contagious Diseases Acts. We have men who prate about individual liberty, and yet, so convinced are they of the necessity

and advantage of Sabbatarian practice, that they forget that other people have the same right to judge as themselves. We have men, we have a large class of men, so impressed, and properly impressed, with the abuses and disgraces of intemperance that they too forget that they have no right to control the individual action of others any more than those others have the right to control theirs. And I come to this in order to give an explanation of a vote I gave which I know did not please all my constituents in the last days of Parliament. I allude to the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill. I voted and spoke against that Bill, because I regarded it as a gross infraction of the personal rights and liberties of the Welsh people. I regarded it as all the more a disgraceful infraction because it is pressed upon the Welsh peasant by those who are not affected by the law in any way whatever, who have their own ample means, cellars, and so forth; the Act tells them, in fact;—although this may be good for you it is not good for us; we like to travel and see your lakes and mountains on Sundays, and so in this restrictive measure we'll put a clause that the *bonâ fide* traveller shall have what he wants. I have heard many different interpretations as to what constituted a *bonâ fide* traveller, in my interpretation it means a man who has means enough to purchase exemption and freedom from the tyranny and intolerance which press only upon the poor and helpless. What is it but the Parliament of England assembled, lords and commons, with particular facilities given by the Government, to pass a Bill in entire opposition to the statements of Mr. Gladstone and the Government not long before? What was the legislative message they sent to the Welsh peasants? 'Taffy, my boy, we're very fond of you; we recognise the sacredness of your individual rights, but, Taffy, my boy, you must not be thirsty on Sundays. Or if nature so far overcome virtue that you do feel thirsty, your beer shall be flat stale, and unprofitable; you shall not buy it on Sunday mornings.'"

THE CLOTURE.

LETTERS OF MR. TAYLOR TO A CONSTITUENT.

(Reprinted from the MIDLAND FREE PRESS (Leicester),

November 18th, 1882.)

“Brighton, 19th February, 1882.

“ . . . It rather surprises me that any of my friends should have thought it doubtful whether I should support a proposition having for its object to put it within the power of a majority to stop discussion upon any questions in the House of Commons. Up to this time, if an Englishman were asked what was the special characteristic of the House of Commons, he would have answered unhesitatingly, *freedom of discussion*, and I for one am not prepared to sacrifice that principle in order to enable a Government to pass into law more rapidly, measures however desirable in themselves.

“My experience, as a Radical Member of Parliament for twenty years, warns me that such a change of procedure would be most injurious in its results. As a Radical it has been naturally my lot frequently to find myself in very small minorities. I have myself introduced questions with which very few sympathised and which, to the great majority, it was irksome even to hear discussed. How often might I not have expected to have been summarily gagged by a majority on the plea that by my impracticable notions I was stopping the course of practical legislation? and yet I venture to think that in my twenty years of Parliamentary life I have not earned the character of being a talker for talking's sake.

“I differ wholly from those who regard the House of Commons as simply a measure-grinding machine. I believe on the other hand that one of its great uses lies in the exercise of that function from which it derives its name (Parliament). It has been rightly called the Great Inquest of the Nation;

and when I see propositions made for diminishing discussion and for curtailing the right of questioning Ministers, for the sake of pushing through Government measures, it appears to me we are entering upon a dangerous and reactionary course.

“At the commencement of every Parliament the old form is preserved of asking for, and receiving from, the Sovereign, the right of free speech. It is not from the power of the Crown that individual liberty has now to be protected, but rather from the tyranny of majorities. The mighty power of the House of Commons resembles what has been said of the elephant's trunk ; it is strong enough to smash a rock, and fine enough to pick up a pin. The great danger we have now to encounter is rather of over-legislation than the reverse. There is now no detail of individual social life too minute or too sacred for the intervention of the law ; yet this is the time chosen for removing whatever protection there may lie in the protest of minorities in the House of Legislature.

“Of course I discriminate, or endeavour to do so, between legitimate opposition and obstruction for obstruction's sake ; but obstruction is to be dealt with by punishing the individual offender, and not by muzzling the House of Commons. I am prepared to support clauses 5 and 9 of the Government resolutions which deal with individual obstructives. It is my decided opinion, that again and again within my experience have bad propositions been withdrawn and bad measures modified, by the exercise, or by the fear of the exercise, of the defensive powers of a minority.

“That the Radical party in the House of Commons should sit quietly by, and see the Government deliberately forge the weapon whose chief force it is certain will in the future be used against the party of progress, is to my mind amazing. It becomes, however, less amazing, though no less painful, when one becomes aware that not a few of the aforesaid Radicals are acting under the strongest pressure from without, and in the teeth of their own convictions. A well-known Radical

member replied to my question as to whether it was possible he was going to support the *Clôture* by saying, 'I detest it, but I am no more free to vote against it, than I should be to refuse my purse on a dark night to a man who held a revolver at my head.'

"If the House of Commons requires purification, that purification must be sought from below, from the constituencies; no permanent advantage can be got by the strength obtained by gagging the minority. If we cannot pass good measures now, they had better wait until indignant constituencies send us to the right about; but it seems we are threatened with a dissolution if the Government should be defeated on the *Clôture*, and it is supposed that a new election would seat the Tories once more in power. So be it, say I for one; rather than diminish the usefulness and degenerate the methods of the British House of Commons. To a Government official who in all courtesy represented to me the danger of this rock a-head, I was glad to be able to reply, 'The Government has done so well the last two years, has stamped out Jingoism, and placed us in comparative safety in regard to Afghanistan and South Africa, that we can, if need be, afford to lose you for a brief term.' While in respect to Ireland, our great difficulty, I do not believe that the Tories will venture to interfere with the working of the Land Act, and in so far as coercion is continued, they could hardly go further than the Liberal Government has done.

"It is impossible for me within the limits of a letter to say all I have to say upon the subject; probably hereafter I may find an opportunity for further, and *viva voce*, communication with my Leicester friends.—Meantime, believe me, my dear sir, very truly yours,

"P. A. TAYLOR.

"P.S.—The Government Press declare that the power under the *Clôture* will not be used—will never be practically oppressive.

"In my opinion it will be used, and with ever-increasing force; else the majority will say money has been wasted in making a cat-o-nine tails which rots for lack of exercise. In Mr. Bradlaugh's case the majority trampled law and tradition under foot, to gratify spite and to strengthen party. What will the majority not do *when we have put the law upon their side?*"

LETTER 2.

"I assure you I have not the slightest disposition to consider any constituent 'impertinent' for expressing with perfect frankness his opinion of any course I may take, or any vote I may give.

"But you, in turn, will excuse me for saying that I think some of your observations are rash and inconsequential. For instance, you say that in voting against the Government I voted 'against all Liberal legislation.' Now, making all allowance for the view you take of the effect of the *Clôture* upon legislation, you will probably admit, upon reconsideration, that you have made a rash statement; that is you state as a fact, of which I must be aware, what is at best only an unproved inference. Hitherto we have passed Liberal measures, strange to say, without the help of the gag!

"Anyhow, my ideal has never been a benevolent despotism, whether under a Louis Napoleon or a majority with power to stop the mouths of their opponents. *Clôture* or no *Clôture*, Liberal measures will get passed when the constituencies have maturely so resolved.

"Again, you say I am 'always on critical occasions found giving voice and vote against the party I was returned to support.' *Always?* Somewhat rash again. Besides, I thought I was pledged rather to principles than to party, and never before did the Liberal party raise for its cry '*Liberty and the gag!*' Every argument now used in favour of the *Clôture* was foreseen, answered, and stamped out by the Premier

F

himself within the last few years. Admirer as I have always been of our great leader—of his intellect and of his character—he has always seemed to me to be very deficient in what I may call *moral and intellectual perspective*. The objects immediately before him he has always pursued with overpowering ardour and enthusiasm, whether the object itself was great or small; sometimes, therefore,

“ ‘ Resembling ocean into tempest tos’t,
To waft a feather, or to drown a fly.’ ”

“ Thus now, in order to hasten legislative measures—some very good, some, in my opinion, very doubtful—he ignores the glorious traditions of parliamentary freedom of debate, and changes all the opinions on the *Clôture* he has hitherto maintained. Nothing less than his commanding genius and his great services could have dragged the Liberal party in the House of Commons after him in this stupendous blunder, with how much reluctance, however, those in the House alone can know.

“ Once more. You make it a charge against me that I am for ever opposing the party who are ‘ in office,’ whether Tory or Liberal. Would you rather that I should for ever be in harmony with the Government of the day? It would be an easier rôle no doubt, but hardly so consistent with Radical opinions.

“ You say members are not sent to the House of Commons ‘ to do as they like, but to represent their constituency.’ True; but are the two conditions inconsistent? Is it not rather taken for granted that on all leading questions the member and his constituents are agreed? Do you really think that any honest or independent man would undergo the wear and toil of sitting in Parliament to vote against his own convictions? *Nothing* could have made me vote for the *Clôture*,—not if every voter in Leicester had wished it. In such case my clear duty would have been to resign my seat at once.

"Finally, let me ask with all respect, on what evidence do you claim to speak for the whole Liberal party? I do not believe that the working men of Leicester are in favour of the *Clôture*. I have seen no notice of any great meeting called to consider the question. Had the Tory party dared to whisper the word *Clôture*, the whole Liberal party would have denounced the 'Tory Gag,' and I usually observe that the working men are apt to stand by their principles at least as staunchly as any other class.

"Yours faithfully,

"P. A. TAYLOR."

The foregoing record will fully bear out the statement of the *Journal* of the Vigilance Association that Mr. Taylor has been eminently a representative of that portion of the people who are still left politically voiceless. It may be said of him, in the words of Mr. Carlyle, that he regarded himself as "sent to St. Stephen's to interpret and articulate the dumb, deep want of the people;" for "whatsoever great British interest could the least speak for itself, for that, beyond all," did he feel himself "called to speak," and a glance over the subjects of his speeches is sufficient to show this. Members of the Vigilance Association will probably regard the speech on *Payment of Members*, and the letters to his constituents on the *Clôture* as specially remarkable. They are the utterances not only of a genuine Radical and sincere believer in individual rights, but of a thoughtful, constitutional, and (in the highest sense of the word) Conservative statesman.

VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION

**For the Defence of Personal Rights and
for the Amendment of the Law.**

*Office:—2, WESTMINSTER CHAMBERS, VICTORIA STREET,
LONDON, S.W.*

Executive Committee :

Mr. JOSEPH ARCH.
Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, M.P.
Mrs. JACOB BRIGHT.
Mrs. R. R. GLOVER.
Mr. ROBERT HAMPSON.
Mrs. KING.
Mr. J. H. LEVY.
Mr. WALTER B. McLAREN.
Mr. W. T. MALLESON, B.A.

Mr. M. E. MARSDEN.
Mr. W. SHAEN, M.A.
Mrs. SHEARER.
Prof. STUART, M.A., LL.D.
Mr. P. A. TAYLOR.
Mrs. P. A. TAYLOR.
Madame VENTURI.
Mr. G. C. W. WARR, M.A.
Miss LUCY WILSON.

Secretary—Mr. J. S. BAILY.

Bankers—THE CONSOLIDATED BANK, LIMITED.

CONSTITUTION.

The object of this Association is to uphold the principle of the perfect equality of all persons before the law, irrespective of sex or class. It seeks the attainment of this object—

I. By labouring to effect the repeal or amendment of all existing laws which directly or indirectly violate the aforesaid principle.

II. By opposing the enactment of all new laws which violate the said principle.

III. By watching over the execution of the laws, to ascertain whether that principle, in so far as it has already received legislative sanction, is duly respected in practice by administrative, judicial and police authorities.

IV. By spreading among the people a knowledge of the rights and liberties to which they are legally entitled, and of the moral grounds on which those legal rights and liberties are founded.

"The JOURNAL of the VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION."

Price 1d.

Published on the 15th of each month, except August and September.

Subscribers to the Vigilance Association of Half-a-Crown and upwards, are entitled to receive *The Journal*. To all other Subscribers and to the public it will be forwarded, post free, on receipt of an Annual Subscription of eighteen pence.

Subscriptions and Donations should be made payable to

The Secretary, Mr. J. S. BAILY.

All cheques should be crossed "*Consolidated Bank, Limited.*"

Postal Address :

2, WESTMINSTER CHAMBERS, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.

7059*861

**This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.**

**A fine is incurred by retaining it
beyond the specified time.**

Please return promptly.